NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Royal Oak, Michigan | October 23, 1939 | Subscription: Three Dollars per Year | 10c

WILL LaGUARDIA BE COMMISSAR OF WAR?

FIORELLO HENRICO LaGUARDIA
Next War Secretary?

MAYOR OF NEW YORK AND MAVERICK NAMED IN GOSSIP OF CABINET

THE NEWS: Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia of New York and former Congressman Maury Maverick of Texas are soon to succeed Secretary of War Woodring and Assistant Secretary Louis Johnson.

Two newspaper gossip columns had this "inside" tip last week.

President Roosevelt is reported fed-up with the Woodring-Johnson feud, while Johnson's preface to "that book about mobilization of American industry for war" lets a black cat out of the bag. ***The Administration does not want the country thinking about war until the embargo has been lifted and more war powers have been granted to the Executive.***

COMMENT: Shades of the last war—and the next! ***LaGuardia for war commissar of America!*** The reader's first reaction is a paraphrase of the song, *"Say It Isn't So."* The gossip might be regarded as a "trial balloon," except that this Administration does not send them up—nor wait upon public reaction to them—witness the notorious Black appointment to the Supreme Court and the determination to seek war powers for the Executive in face of millions of protesting letters from the American people.

It has long been understood that the Administration wanted to "do something for LaGuardia" as a reward for the support of his American Labor Party and the New York radicals, whose idol he is.

SOCIAL JUSTICE readers already know the LaGuardia war record: As a secret agent in the World War, while ostensibly an aviator in Italy in 1918, he is reported to have headed a conspiracy to overthrow Hungary—a plot that his reputed kinsman, Bela Kun, carried out with murderous effect.

LaGuardia's speech at the opening of the $5-million Soviet pavilion at the New York Fair was so "hot" that newspapers were afraid to report it. He paid tribute to Communism as "a rare contribution to mankind." As the country's arch anti-Nazi over the last six years, LaGuardia has rallied a following of Reds and Jewish internationalists.

It may be that Administration advisors think that LaGuardia in the Cabinet will be a "popular appointment; or, again, it may be an answer to the *American Hebrew's* now famous question, *"Will Eli Eli Triump' Over Horst Wessel?"*

The *American Hebrew* writer predicted that the "great sons of Israel would combine to send the frenzied Nazi dictator to hell." He also saw the nations of Leon Blum, Hore-Belisha and Maxim Litvinov in league against Hitler. And it just may be that LaGuardia is their hope to offset the defection of Litvinov!

FROM THE TOWER *By* Father Coughlin ★ **FRANCE MAKES DEAL ON HER OWN** *By* Dr. J. S. Barnes ★ **RADICAL LABOR CHIEFS ENDANGER NEW YORK JEWRY**

DINNER CHATS
From the Staff

Robert S. Allen

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

By DREW PEARSON
and ROBERT S. ALLEN

Drew Pearson

(Editor's Note—The Washington Merry-Go-Round has already the conglomeration of lobbies, mostly Protestant, working against Roosevelt on the arms embargo issue. Today Pearson and Allen describe the Catholic side of the pro-embargo lobby.)

WASHINGTON—When a well known senator returned from a recent trip, he told Senator Byrnes of South Carolina, who is leading Roosevelt's fight to amend the Neutrality Act: "The big thing you've got to lick is the Catholic Church."

THE CLIPPING which heads the Chat department this week is the familiar Pearson and Allen Washington comment column for Monday, October 2. Most newspapers subscribing to the syndicate did not print it—at the request (it is reported) of the Administration.

A few editors, like those of the *Newark Ledger*, told the White House errand boy to go jump in the proverbial lake, and printed the column.

"Catholic pressure, especially on the House of Representatives, was so strong that it created much concern in the Administration," observes the dual commentators.

"At the same time it caused certain New Dealers to act very vigorously *in co-operation with such Catholic leaders as Cardinal Mundelein, Bishop Sheil and Dr. Sheehy*, with the result that the Catholic Church is now about as split over neutrality as the Protestants. There are now powerful forces within the Church for lifting the embargo.

"It was no accident that Bishop Sheil of Chicago had luncheon with the President last Wednesday. The bishop had just flown the Atlantic on a clipper plane, after visiting Rome, where he had an audience with the Pope.

"It was also no accident that he had conferred with Roosevelt just before he left the U. S. for Rome. Immediately after Bishop Sheil left Rome, *Osservatore Romano*, Vatican City newspaper, published an editorial strongly supporting Roosevelt.

"Finally, it is no accident that Bishop Sheil is opening the Catholic Youth Conference in Cincinnati today with a national radio hook-up. He is making this speech on the instruction of Cardinal Mundelein."

(Editor's Note: The sudden death of Cardinal Mundelein on the very eve of the broadcast did not postpone it, but on the other hand, served to give the auxiliary bishop of Chicago an even wider press.)

Messers. Pearson and Allen continue:

"Note—On the afternoon following Bishop Sheil's luncheon with Roosevelt, Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming, who is close to the Church and who had been very much on the fence regarding neutrality, suddenly announced that he was standing with Roosevelt.

"Despite the neutrality position of many high-placed Catholic leaders," the Washington columnists report, "it remains a fact that the most violent of all the opposition to lifting the embargo comes from Father Coughlin and other groups within the Church.

"The *Sunday Visitor*, a Catholic weekly sold at churches all over the country, recently published a strong front page editorial and an article by Gertrude M. Coogan, formerly associated with Father Coughlin. Copies of this were sent to a large number of Congressmen.

"In Cleveland, Archbishop Schrembs recently sent out a pastoral letter which was read in all churches in the Cleveland archdiocese denouncing attempts to lift the embargo."

And the Washington columnists might also have included the forthright and outspoken archbishop of Dubuque, His Excellency the Most Rev. Francis J. L. Beckman, as well as the California bishops whose letter was reproduced in SOCIAL JUSTICE last week.

Someone Must Lead

"If social reforms had to wait till a majority of people demanded them they might never come at all. Even advantages apparently obvious are often rejected until experience has shown them to be what they are," observes the *Christian Science Monitor*.

"Statesmen reluctant to commit themselves to social reforms have often excused themselves on the ground that they must wait for evidence of popular demand. But it is through the few who have first perceived the need of changes that civilization has progressed. . . ."

Many innovations, like the 16 principles of Christian Social Justice, are supported at first by small minorities and later receive general public approval.

"It would be against the public conscience to reverse the movement," concludes the *Monitor* editorial. "When the wise, the experienced and the public-spirited can produce powerful reasons for introducing a new social reform, it ought to be considered on its merits."

Pete Goes to Bat

H'LO FOLKS:

Some peepuL thinK tHey gOT a lot uv nerve. I'm jus' floPPing my ears wITH jOY becuZ I git a chance t'teLL theM that they're not so darned imporTanT as theY thinK they Are. Yeah, y'know who I'm taLKIN' abouT —that biG, blacK-'n-whiTe bruther uv mine. He'z been calfin' aroun' Here about hOw sMart hE iz, 'n abOUT hOW Mary feeds him, 'n abouT how he lOOks after t' circulashun, 'n about hOW He boSSeS thiS sek'tary 'n that sek'tary, 'n about a lOt uv other things.

Well, I'm glaD he went on a holliday 'cuz I c'n SHow you that he's not so hOTsie-totsie as he tHinks he iz. (DaRn it, this tyPe-Riter duzzen't wurk righT).

Here I aM all t'time dOWN at MotHer Coughlin's House. We have all kinDs uv nice trees in t'backyard —biG trEEs 'n littul trees—'n I have more PLace t'run aroun' thaN they've gOt where that plug-ugly Pal liVes. Yeah, my Boss—'n I don't mean Pal's Boss either—she haz a sweLL garage fer me wheN it's raining 'n a NIce soft mat fer me in t'hOuse when I'm good.

Guess I've been bad a cuPPla timeS. T'other day sHE wuz talkin' t'some friends in t'front rOOm. I diddunt like iT—they were talkin' 'bout neW haTS 'n a Lot uv fol-der-ols (i think that's t'way t'spell it) that diddun't interest me. So, d'ya know what I did? I sneak'd upstaiRS. Down i came ruNNin' with someTHIng she called a "sLip." I don't meaN I sliPPed downstaiRs er ennything, but I HAdda slip in mY mouTH. 'N I ran into t'parlor 'n I shooK t'old slip rigHT in FRont uv Missus CouGHLIn 'n her friends— 'n if she Wasn't mad! Oh BOy, did I rUN! I ran in the dining rOOm 'n around t'table. I ran in t'parloR 'n jump'd over tHe davenpORt. I ran UP tHE backK stairs 'n DOwn t'front stairs—'n all t'time I hAD t'old slip whiCH wuz gettin' kinda torn. 'N finaLLy I wuz corner'd. WHAM! I got it—righT where I sit doWN. The whammin' I got diddun't huRT as mutch as t'hear her say: "You're nothin' BUt an OlD ruffnecK! Y're not haf as Nice as Pal."

* * *

Well, if ya want t'know t'truTH, Pal's a sissy. He's alwaYs salvin' 'round Mrs. Coughlin. He's always a nicety-nice littul BOy 'n wouldun't SAy "darn it" even iF ya stepp'd ON hiS tail. 'N I'm look'd on as tHE oLD, flap-eared ruffneck.

F'got t'tell ya anutheR insident in mY lIfe. Pal's Boss is pRETTy niCE t'me. T'other night he cAME down 'n says: "Hi ya, Pete. Like a RIde?" Pal wuzn't with hIM. So I hopp'd in t'back 'n reely enJOY'd my new showfur. There he wuz sittin' in t'front seat aLL Alone. 'N I wuz sitting in t'back seat all aloNE. Well, that wuz kinda ridikulus, don't ya think? So I upS 'n jumps OVer t'back of tHE frONT seat 'n landeD righT at hIS sIDE. WHoopee! He got eksited. THe cAR start'd zig-zaggin' 'N he pushed Me in t'face 'n puntch'd mE in the Ribs 'n Finally he puLL'd up aT t'side uv thE roaD 'n sed: "Pete, wHAT t'heck are ya tryin' t'do? Reck t'institushon?" So I sez: "Aw, be yerself. I jus' come OVer to sit ALongside uv you. DOn't I smeLL nice?" Ennyway, He bought SOMe cakeS 'n t'two uv US hadda luntch in t'country 'n we CAMe home jus' as T'sun wuz settin'.

* * *

Y'know wHEN I wuz puppier thaN I am, I used t'git milk ev'ry mornin'. That wuz aWAY bacK last suMMer when t'folks used t'git up aBOUt 5:30 O'CLock. D'ya know, they'RE beginNNin' t'slEEp in a littul bit? So, t'otheR morning I jus' sat on MY hauntcheS 'n lifted mY head n' stretch'd mY necK 'n Oh bOY, did I Let 'er go! I neerly deafen'd myseLF. After abouT 4 er 5 miNNutes of hittin' hIGH C, Mistur CouGHLin came dOWN t'see who wuz bein' Murder'd. I couldin't helP but waG mY tail a littul bit FastER t'see that I wuz so suksessful. But I gess I griNN'd tOO mutch when I lOOk'd at His slippers 'n hiS batHrobe. He sez t'me: "What are ya tRYIn' t'do, Pete—waKE up all t'neighbors?" 'N I sez t'him: "Oh no, BoSS, I jus' trieD t'wake you Up. Issint it TIme fer thE miLK man?" SO, good SPORt that He iz, he got t'milk out, gavE me a swell drink 'n tOOk me upstairs.

WeLL, Missus Coughlin wuz sleepin' 'n p'raps doin' a littul snorin' on 'er own akkount. Y'know, I kinda FELt sorrY fer hER. So I hoPP'd rite in bed on top uv her. Did she evEr sit up StraighT 'n take NOtice! "Get out uv here, You raskal! Get out uv here, you raskal!" wuz all she cud say. 'N I jus' nuzzled my Old cold NOse a littul bit clOser up under her arM. Yeah, theRe she goes agin—she reach'd fer her sliPPer 'n start'd paddlin' me. Y'know, sum peepuL think tHAT aLL a dog's konscience iz made fur iz t'be paddl'd.

* * *

'N uv all t'surprizes, I got a BATh t'other day 'n had my new Kollar put on 'n wuz takeN out t'the offise. Old flat-foot Pal wuzn't aroun'. He wuz gone on hiz vacashun, so I skribbl'd a NoTE t'hiM 'N sed: "Ya biG buLLy, whY don't ya staY hoME 'N do yer job? T'circulashun dePARTmenT looks s'if a U-Boat struck it, 'n t'subscripshuns aren't cummin' in enny fastER than t'money GReat Brittin owes us. Oh Pal uv mine, Pleeze don't bE flurting with Finnland all yer life. Do yer dooty instead uv shootiN' t'bull in YEr kOlum."

T'next day I got a leTTer frum hIM—a saSSy letter whitch told mE t'staY oFF hiz Premmisez 'N t'stoP mussin' uP hiz desK 'n t'keeP out uv hiZ backYard.

Well, I'm givvin' thaT luG formul nOtise that if hE caN'T do beTTer witH t'circulashun I'm gonna chizzel iN on hiz joB 'n worK fer less 'n do MOre.

Well, folks, I knOW I havvunt got mutcH maNNerz evun if I'm a grajuate uv Mishigan's beST dog SkOOL, but I'M sick 'n tiREd uv havin' no joB all during tHIs dePreshun, 'n bein' look'D on az a prOfeshunal blind mAn's tIn cup fer that bLack-'n-White bruther uv mINE. I tell ya, folKS, I'm givin' notise tO t'Boss, 'n I want thiS t'be taken seriusly.

After I rite this, I guess I'll go aroun t'find MarY 'n asK her fer a littuL drink uv MIlk befor I git in Mistur Coughlin'S cAR t'go homE 'n see t'Missus.

Daddy Schwartz is jus' behind mE 'n he'z shakin' hiz head at t'waY I rite. He sez: "Pete, don't ya know thE diFFrunce betWeen a caPitul letteR 'N a smaLL one?" 'N I sez: "WHo kares?" 'n he sed: "I kare." 'n I said: "If mY stuFF izzunt gOOD enuf fer page 2, puT it on t'TOWEr page, or on yer edditorial pagE becuz t'peepul think more uv me than tHEy do uv a lotta otheRS I knoW around here." 'N he says: "I've a noshun t'throW it in t'wastepapER basket." 'N I sez: "if y'do, I'll cheW yer wooden leG." 'N he sez: "You win, PetE." N I says: "GooDbyE."

Yers untIL Pal ruNs aWAY agAIN,

—PETE

SOCIAL JUSTICE, National Weekly, Copyrighted 1939 by The Social Justice Publishing Company; publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed, all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted, either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. 4A October 23, 1939 No. 17

State of the Nation

Roosevelt Ready to Take Total Power

Tank of Dictatorship is Assembled, Fueled, Greased; He Has Only to Press the Starter

THE NEWS: A responsible Washington correspondent stated last week on the basis of information which he personally obtained, that the New Dealers in the present administration "look to a war emergency for the opportunity to deal the capitalist system a death blow, and socialize industry generally." The correspondent cited the "limited emergency" declared by Mr. Roosevelt, and said that if it should be succeeded by a "full emergency," the President could transform the nation overnight into a dictatorship on the Fascist pattern, from which democracy would be removed

---

COMMENT: The correspondent referred to, (Arthur Sears Henning of the *Chicago Tribune*) has placed his pen on a very real threat to democracy in America. It is still possible to object to the warmaking policies of President Roosevelt and his aides. But after the "full emergency" has been declared; after the repealed arms embargo law has perhaps created this "full emergency," then it will be too late to object. For the country then will be governed by a dictator.

Thus we come to the sad contradiction of the war abroad as a whole. The advertised slogan of this war, on the part of the "democracies," is that it is a bitter-end struggle to "defeat dictatorship." Yet the "great democracies" themselves, under the inspiration of their war-minded leaders, have become dictatorships in the full understanding of that word.

And so too would dictatorship replace democracy in the United States, should this nation be propagandized, or driven, into a war against Hitler, or Hitler and Stalin, on the basis that it is a war against dictatorship. We would be fighting dictatorship, while existing under it.

Plans Were Made Eight Years Ago

For those who would reject these considerations as wild guessing, or bogy-hunting, the following facts should serve as a convincer. In wartime, or under a "full emergency," the processes of democracy would be suspended or scrapped, one by one. Industry would be mobilized one-hundred per cent to furnish arms to armies in the field. Manpower would be drafted and conscripted to furnish an expeditionary force of millions, and to man the factories from which youthful workers would have been recruited for military service.

The prices of raw materials and consumer goods would be fixed under rigid control by a commission with dictatorial authority, subject only to the President himself.

Stocks, bonds and all private investments would fall under the influence of a control commission with similar dictatorial authority, and directed by the President.

Other agencies and commissions, similarly set up, would regulate and control transportation, resources, and utilities vital to industry and commerce. The President would be virtually absolute dictator over these agencies, and over the industries and utilities concerned.

This "pattern for dictatorship," the plan under which the President would be empowered to scuttle democracy, was drawn in 1931, under the Hoover administration, by the War Department. It was known as the Industrial Mobilization Plan. Its structure has been retained but its form has been changed and amended by the present administration which, possibly, saw that it would go into effect while President Roosevelt was in office.

'See You After the War'

The amended, New Deal version of the Mobilization Plan had the frankness to state in its forenote that, "The objective of any warring nation is victory, immediate and complete It is conceivable that a war might be conducted with such great regard for individual justice and administrative efficiency as to make impossible those evils whose existence in past wars is well known. It is also conceivable that the outcome of a war so conducted might be defeat. In all plans for preparedness and politics to be pursued in event of war it must never be overlooked that while efficiency in war is desirable, effectiveness is mandatory."

It is obvious from the foregoing statement that while the administration has a fine regard for democracy —within certain limits — democracy might clutter up the picture in event of war. Let doubting critics re-read that statement and see how their own reason stands up against its testimony

Furthermore, in time of war, the cabinet and other advisory and administrative offices cease to exist for all effective purposes. The President is commander-in-chief of the army and navy. He has a "pipeline" that leads directly to the War and Navy Departments, and through this pipeline he issues commands—not suggestions—that govern the Army, the Navy, Joint Boards composed of representatives of each; he controls munitions establishments, and other agencies involved.

The President has a clearly-defined dictator's power over national resources, trade, labor, manpower, prices, and financial implements. The cabinet, governing boards and commissions with administrative and semi-judicial functions are politely waved aside with the admonition, "see you after the war."

Congress sits supinely on the sidelines while the dictator-president runs the show. An "advisory defense council" sits in with the President to make suggestions, which the dictator-president may accept or reject, depending on his whim.

'Congress Will Fix It Up'

President Roosevelt and his New Dealers have been bold in laying their plans for war. Those of them whose socialistic ideas visualize the dismemberment of capitalism in the United States have been flattered to find many of their suggestions written into the plans. And those of the President's advisers who have objected to details along the way have been dropped from consideration, more or less quietly. This may explain in part the persistent rumor that War Secretary Harry Woodring, and his assistant Louis Johnson, are to be purged, and replaced in office by Fiorello LaGuardia, New York's radical mayor, and Maury Maverick, mayor of San Antonio, Texas, and longtime Leftist

President Roosevelt already has ignored statutory provisions governing methods of providing for an enlarged army and navy personnel. He has done this deliberately, and with a shoulder-shrug for the illegal nature of his act, protesting that Congress will "fix it up" sometime next January. This is deadly serious business, for it concerns the rights and liberties of American citizens

This action drew the caustic censure of Representative John Taber of New York, who condemned the President in these words: "So amazing is this flouting of constitutional government and so dangerous the precedent set that I can not remain silent, despite a desire to be co-operative at this time Why did the President ignore the simple, straightforward, legal way and choose to flout the law and the constitution in the hope that the Congress, when it meets next January, would legalize then what he had done illegally now?"

Let all Americans who value democracy and the United States Constitution give careful thought to acts that lead to war. Once we are in, our government will be changed. We shall never emerge from another war as a democracy.

The Issue

FOR MANY YEARS Father Coughlin has been militating against the usury associated with the private issuance and control of money.

For many years he has been pointing out the iniquities of international finance. Oftentimes he has quoted for you the stirring words of Pius XI, to-wit:

> "In the first place, then, it is patent that in our days not alone is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few, and that those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, who administer them at their good pleasure.
>
> "This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life blood to the entire economic body, and grasping, as it were, in their hands the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will. . . .
>
> **"This concentration of power has led to a threefold struggle for domination. First, there is the struggle for dictatorship in the economic sphere itself; then, the fierce battle to acquire control of the state, so that its resources and authority may be abused in the economic struggles. Finally, the clash between states themselves."**

And now we are thinking of getting into this world war, this "clash between states themselves." We are getting into it to save this damnable system of international capitalism, of money control, of usury, and of exploitation.

Don't let any person tell you that this is a holy war—a war of Christianity against Communism. It is no such thing. It is a war that will bring Communism to our shores if we do not institute a reform immediately.

Red Lights In Manhattan

(By a Staff Correspondent)

NEW YORK — Another example of the rotten, Red-coddling administrative policies of Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia was brought to light last week when it was discovered that the "Little Flower" had made a deal with a Jewish construction company to ban public meetings from Columbus Circle

Until recently, the Circle was a hotbed of Red and Jewish agitation against Christian Americanism, and like Union Square, 45 blocks to the south, had come to be considered by New Yorkers as Little Moscow.

This summer, however, the Christian Front and other patriotic groups baited the Soviet arsonists in their own lair and, for the first time, the Stars and Stripes of the United States out-fluttered the red rag in Columbus Circle

This was too much for LaGuardia and the Jewish, Communist and animalist stooges who help the Mayor retain his un-American stranglehold over the exploited Christians of New York. Last week it was announced that a new apartment hotel will be built on Columbus Square and that the Mayor had promised the builders to prohibit all pro-American rallies in the area before the construction work is completed next summer.

When this correspondent tried to find out who was erecting the new apartment hotel, he was told it was "The Taylor Construction Co." Upon investigation, this name plate turned out to be a fanciful window-dressing for the Mayer Brothers, a Jewish concern which has already built the radical, culture-twisting New School for Social Research in Greenwich Village.

It was understood that Mayer Brothers refused to begin work on the new project until they had a written guarantee from Mayor LaGuardia that Christian meetings in Columbus Circle would be permanently outlawed Jews evidently considered an apartment house a cheap price to pay for the liquidation of one of Christianity's main strongholds in New York.

Sinister Wings Over the Capitol

If the Administration's Bill passes; if the Neutrality Bill gets us into the vestibule of European war, then we will have entered upon a crusade to preserve the abuses of international capitalism—the system which, in its abuses, was so roundly and deservedly castigated by the great Pius XI.

Do not be deceived. As Father Coughlin has so often said: **"International Capitalism is the right wing, Communism is the left wing, of the same bird of prey."**

The time left for all of us to act is not great. The odds against which we are fighting are tremendous Mr. Roosevelt and his Administration are riding on the head of the bird of prey. One day they lean over to the side of the left wing and pat Communism condescendingly; the next day they smooth out the feathers of the right wing — the International Capitalists' wing.

The fight that we have been waging for freedom under the inspiration of Father Coughlin will be won or lost on the basis of our getting into war or staying out of it.

This is the day he has been waiting for. This is the day for all of you to act—now. Contact your Representative. If you are idle now, you will be idle, economically, for years to come.

By Ben Marcin

The Dictator Peril

American President Already Most Powerful of All Modern Dictators

"The President's powers are so great (even now) that he can use them to involve the nation in a foreign war." —*New York Times, September 3, 1939*

As Disclosed by the compilation of the Chief Executive's powers, enumerated by Attorney General Murphy in response to the resolution of Senator Vandenberg, the President of the United States, under his own proclamation of national emergency, stands today the greatest potentate in modern times.

Except that he lacks the power of life and death—which he also will possess by the declaration of war—the Chief Executive of the United States holds the greatest power in the history of modern dictatorships.

It has been said that the President cannot sentence American citizens to concentration camps, like the dictators of Europe, but the truth of the matter is that he will acquire this very power under the provisions of the numerous war measures now pending consideration by the Congress.

Unlike the impoverished dictators of the modern totalitarian States, President Roosevelt possesses the power to dispose of the countless billions of dollars of America's actual and potential wealth. In the seven years of his New Deal program for reform and recovery, President Roosevelt **has spent more money than all the dictators of Europe and Asia** combined in their great programs of public works and national rearmament.

More Than 100 Acts Grant Special Powers

Stripping the Attorney General's report of all legal verbiage and legalistic technicality, we discover that the New Dealers have enacted more than 100 acts granting the Chief Executive powers in a crisis. Is there any wonder that the President has proclaimed crises so often that they have become a *stasis*?

The Attorney General even refused to answer Senator Vandenberg's queries concerning the Chief Executive's other powers, saying that an opinion would involve rendering a legal decision to Congress.

At the outset of the European war, the Chief Executive invoked the *National Defense Act of 1914* as subsequently amended many times. Thus, the President is enabled to do many things "upon the outbreak of war, or when, in his opinion, war is imminent" which he could not otherwise do.

The United States is at peace. War for us is not imminent; yet the Chief Executive has issued an emergency proclamation under the National Defense Act to make himself the sole possessor of the power of supreme authority in the entire industrial and economic orders of the United States.

A cursory reading of the National Defense Act, Section II, will be sufficient to convince even the amateur student that the Chief Executive has, in fact, made himself a dictator. All industry, agriculture, business, politics, production, distribution and consumption are the President's to order and to direct. Some of these powers are derived from the Constitution, some from war statutes as old as a century and others from Congress.

Already Has Suppressed Lower House of Congress

Under *Section 10, Act of June 10, 1920* "when the safety of the United States demands it" the President may take over power plants, dams, conduits and apparatus for the manufacture of explosives and munitions. Under *Section 805, Act of Sept. 8, 1916*, the President is able "to prohibit or restrict the importation into the United States of articles from such country." Under *Section 606, Act of June 19, 1934*, the President has power to amend or to suspend rules and regulations applicable to the transmission of communications by radio or wire. According to the *Federal Reserve Act* and the *Gold Nationalization and Revaluation Act*, the President exercises dictatorial power over the Federal Reserve and the monetary system.

Already the Chief Executive has ordered the army, navy and marine corps to recruit man and arms powers to peace time strength. He has ordered expenditures for army and navy supplies and housing which did not have Congressional approval. To avoid the difficulty of consulting the Appropriations Committee of the Congress and while Congress was in session, the President ordered all but a few members of the Lower House to leave Washington and commanded that the House should meet two days a week as long as its committees promised that they would report no bills and would suggest no amendments or changes to existing legislation.

The consideration of the Administration's amendments to the present Neutrality Bill has been forbidden the Congress of the House of Representatives and only a joint committee of Administration "wheel horses" from the House will consider the Senate Report on the Neutrality Bill.

The Chief Executive, following the lead of the European dictators, *has suppressed the lower branch of the legislature in Government* and committed its powers to Administration appointees recruited from the House!

Texas Supreme Court Recites President's Power

Even two years ago, long before the President declared the present national emergency of war, Chief Justice William R. Pattangall of the Supreme Court of Texas, made the following analysis of the President's powers: "Since March 4, 1933, either by direct Congressional enactment or by Executive order based on such legislation, the Chief Magistrate of the nation has been given or has assumed authority:

"To debase the currency; to buy and sell gold at a price fixed arbitrarily by him; to purchase Government bonds, and to seize private stocks or gold to be paid for at an arbitrary valuation; To levy taxes, denominated process taxes on food, clothing and merchandise at such times and rates as he may determine; To expend enormous sums of money for various purposes not definitely and explicitly defined before the appropriation of the money; to create business corporations whose activities bring them into direct competition with private business; to manufacture commodities in competition with private business; to buy and sell commodities, fix minimums at which industries and merchants may sell their goods; to allot a maximum production to individual farms and factories, and to forbid expansion or development in any industry or any single plant to impose collective bargaining on employers or labor, and to establish minimum wages and maximum hours of labor in every line of industry; to raise and lower tariffs and discriminate between nations in the application thereof; to abrogate and annul certain Government contracts without compensation and without appeal or review by the Courts; to inflate the currency."

At present, the eight War Emergency Acts, among which are the Connally, Lee and May Bills, which must be considered by the Congress in the event of war or of a crisis, would place more power in the hands of the President than all the legislation to date. The enactment of these bills would bestow upon the Chief Executive the power to control all vehicles for the communication of news, to peg prices; to determine wages, to regulate production, consumption and distribution; to confiscate the private wealth of citizens; to nationalize all private property; to suppress the liberties granted in the Bill of Rights, to imprison all political opponents; to establish himself as absolute dictator, and to pervert a Republic into a Fascist-Communist dictatorship.

If these bills ever become law, the Chief Executive of the United States will be the most dictatorial dictator, the most powerful potentate and the most tyrannical tyrant in the history of the world. Overnight, Americans will become an enslaved, impoverished, regimented and tyrannized people.

If America enters the war; Americans will see their Chief Executive, their elected President, become the dictator of the richest, most powerful and freest nation in the world. Compared to America's dictator, Russia's Stalin, Germany's Hitler, France's Daladier, and Italy's Mussolini will be so many "ward heelers and precinct bosses."

Ominous Rumor

With Ominous frequency of late, the press columnists have announced the eventual appointment of Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Mayor of New York City, to be Secretary of War. (See Page 1.) Recently the same columnists have added the name of Maury Maverick of Texas as "Assistant Secretary."

Secretary Harry Woodring has been out of favor with the Administration ever since he refused to obey White House orders relayed through Secretary Morgenthau relative to the secret sale of American planes to the Allies by subsidies of the United States Treasury.

It got so, that, whenever things were breaking too hot in Washington, Woodring was sent to inspect coastal defenses somewhere, and his assistant, Louis Johnson, came to be regarded as the functioning secretary. What Woodring refused to do, Johnson accommodatingly did; that is, he co-operated with the munition makers, plane producers and arms salesmen and frequently permitted British, French and Russian visitors to inspect American arms plants and methods.

The appointments of LaGuardia and Maverick would be certain to meet a storm of public protest. Revelations of the Dies Committee disclose the extent to which Communists have endangered the military establishment of the United States. The Mayor of New York and the Mayor of San Antonio have notoriously coddled Communists. Furthermore, LaGuardia and Maverick would be too smooth a complement to the War Offices of other lands, with notably, Hore-Belisha in England; Eugene Dautry in France and Voroshilov in Soviet Russia.

Arming the Islands

Now It Can be told. For months America has proceeded rapidly with the militarization of the Hawaiian Islands in a pace similar to that pursued in creating adequate protection for the Panama Zone. It seems certain that America has definitely decided that its first line of defense is the Hawaiian Islands and not the indefensible Phillipines or the relatively unimportant Guam. In view of this, there can be little doubt that America and Britain, as well as France, have a secret agreement, whereby America agrees to master the Pacific while the Allies are occupied with their mistressing of the Atlantic. In obedience to her commitment, America dispatched her ships to the Pacific when the Allied fleets were first involved in the Mediterranean. And since that time America's fleets have patrolled the Pacific for the Allies.

Under the direction of army and navy experts the forts at Pearl Harbor and Diamond Head have become Gibraltars and Heligolands. Sixteen-inch naval guns have been mounted on the naval defenses. Great railroad guns of the army and navy roll along newly constructed lines. The armed forces of army, navy and marine corps have been increased so that they constitute formidable warring forces. Army engineers have constructed hundreds of miles of heavy roads capable of carrying the heavy mechanized military machines.

The U. S. Army and Navy has dispatched hundreds of planes, scouts, pursuit and heavy bombers to Hawaii, where they are quartered in underground bomb-proof hangars. Hawaii has become an armed outpost of America.

It is a matter of knowledge among military experts that America has thus armed her insular possessions, first to prevent a Japanese attack against the Islands, and secondly to dissuade Japan from attacking Australia, and the British possessions.

Elliott Defies N.A.B.

On Saturday, October 7th, Elliott Roosevelt, a commentator for Emerson Radio Co., speaking over the Mutual network challenged the National Association of Broadcasters to carry out its latest regulation regarding controversialists. At the outset of his broadcast, Commentator Roosevelt warned his audience that he was going to discuss the "pros" and "cons" of the neutrality controversy and that *he was going to give his personal opinion on the matter*. He emphasized the fact that he knew he was violating the recent interpretation of the N.A.B. Code on controversialists. He forewarned his audience that stations carrying his broadcast might pull the plugs on him during the broadcast. Certainly, he was violating the regulation and its recent interpretation which forbade that member stations sell time to paid commentators who would discuss the controversial issue of neutrality.

But the member stations of the N.A.B. did not "cut" Roosevelt's address.

The action of the stations was explicable when we realize that Elliott Roosevelt, manager-owner of a Texas chain of radio stations, and son of the President, was the herald of the N.A.B. Code, when he declared that the forfeiture of the right of freedom of speech by the radio stations was not too great a price to pay if Father Coughlin, "the anti-Semite" from Royal Oak, were silenced. Mr. Roosevelt himself gave the reason why he was not cut off the air—the regulation itself and the interpretation of the regulation decreed by the N.A.B., and directed at Father Coughlin.

'We, the People'

The Old Shell Game

Will American Taxpayers Again Fall for a $3,000,000,000 Swindle?

By BEN MARCIN

The Nye Senate Committee hearing (January 13, 1936), presented Mr. T. W. Lamont of the J. P. Morgan Company. He stated:

The total amount of American exports during these neutral years to the four great Allies, Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy, were $7-billion. Of that, not over $2-billion were in what were called munitions of war. The other $5-billion were in commodities, foodstuffs, cotton, raw materials, metals, manufactured goods of a general order.

On January 9, 1936, Robert Wohlforth, testified the following at the Nye Senate Committee hearing:

In the war years 1915 to 1917, inclusive, the American export trade in arms, munitions, iron, steel and other war materials totaled $2,187,000,000, and of this, the Morgan firm handled $1,843,000,000, or 84 per cent. This was exclusive of other purchases, such as wheat, cotton, etc., which would bring the purchases to well in excess of $3-billion.

"Was all this money paid?" asked Mr. Wohlforth.

"Yes, in every instance the money was paid." George Whitney, a Morgan partner, replied.

It was disclosed before the Nye Committee that Morgan and Company arranged 888 contracts. Following are some of them:

To the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Company for explosives, $429,785,000.

To the Aetna Explosive Company, $58,114,000.

To the American Can Company for shells and tin cans, $33,433,000.

To the American Car and Foundry Company for shells, steel wheels, etc., $43,047,000.

To the American Locomotive Company for shells, $99,138,000.

To the American Smelting and Refining Company for copper and other metals, $234,000,000.

To the American Foundry Company for shells, $35,496,000.

To Baldwin Locomotive Works for locomotives, shells, etc., $55,731,000.

To the Bethlehem Steel Corporation for shells, guns etc., $246,499,000.

To E. W. Bliss & Co. for shells and black powder, $38,000,000.

To Butterworth Judson Company for gun cotton, oleum and picric acid, $55,000,000.

To Edystone Ammunition Company for shells, $40,000,000.

To the General Electric for fuses, searchlights, etc., $28,346,000.

To Hercules Powder Company for explosives, $68,946,000.

To Hudson Metal Products Company for shells, $32,197,000.

To Inland Steel Company for shells, $33,400,000.

To Lackawanna Steel Company for shells, tuluol, etc., $28,000,000.

To Maas & Waldstein for gun cotton, $31,000,000.

To Midvale Steel for shells, howitzers, etc., $43,368,000.

To Westinghouse of New England for rifles, $48,000,000.

To Pollak Steel Company for shells, etc., $25,591,000.

To Remington Arms-U.M.C. Company for rifles, $63,000,000.

To Remington Arms of Delaware for rifles, $60,000,000.

To Semet Solvay Company for picric acid, benzol, etc., $35,450,000.

To Swift & Co. for corned beef and pork, $9,245,000.

To United States Steel Products Company for steel products, $123,-778,000.

To Washington Steel and Ordnance Company for shells and copper bands, $59,834,183.

To Winchester Repeating Arms for cartridges, $25,546,000.

To Youngstown Sheet and Iron Co. for steel products, $41,129,000.

Who paid for this blood business? Who profited by this blood business? Who lost by this blood business?

All He Got Was a Promise

The British Ambassador, Spring-Rice, at Washington, cabled that the credits which were causing jitters in the American money market WOULD BE MET BY THE UNITED STATES TREASURY. The Britisher knew that the American people would hold the bag.

These credits totaled around $400-million. The innocent Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, wanted to lay his own hands on these obligations; he insisted that the Treasury should actually get hold of the collateral. Neither he nor the Treasury succeeded in doing this; for all he got was a promise that the British would deposit these securities.

Thus, the unbusinesslike Secretary of the Treasury was urged to withdraw his demand for actual deposits.

Matters stood in that state until Andrew Mellon became Secretary of the Treasury. He, too, failed to get his hands on the securities.

Thus, the answer is that the private capitalists, including Morgan and Company, got paid and made profits—as George Whitney said they did at the Nye Committee hearing. To be sure, they made their money out of the blood business, but the dear American public held the bag and still holds it.

'Afraid of the Submarines'

A similar plan to force the American public to hold the bag in 1939 is under way. This plan proposes to deposit money in England and to secure credit under the cash-and-carry plan. The British will say: "We have billions upon billions of dollars of gold, silver, diamonds, emeralds and precious materials here in England. Gladly we would ship them to the United States; but we are afraid of the submarines. Let us hold them here in Merry Old England. We will be glad to give you a telephone call or a cable telling you that all of it is yours; that all of it is collateral. You make the shells, the munitions and the airplanes. Send them across to us at our risk and on our boats. (Of course, we are not afraid of the submarines between America and England; we are afraid of them only between England and America)."

Dear reader, this shell game was tried before on the American public and it worked. Why let it operate again?

To revive some ancient history, here is a cablegram sent by our Ambassador in Great Britain (Page) to the Secretary of State.

File No. 841.51/41

London, March 9, 1917, 3 P.M.
(Received 5:30 P.M.)

5817. My 5794, March 5, 1 P.M. The Governor of the Bank of England called on me yesterday and confirmed every important statement made in my foregoing telegram. He enlarged on the difficulty of shipping gold because of submarine danger and is embarrassed to know how to pay for supplies from United States already ordered. He asked me if it would now be possible for reserve banks, in view of submarine danger, to take short time credits. He outlined a plan for the reserve banks to rediscount ninety-day bills guaranteed by the Bank of England and asked me to inquire if this could be done. Please instruct me what answer.

PAGE

If we get cash for anything from England, we want the cash delivered in the United States. We have had enough of promises.

Why the Sudden Bogey Hunt?

THE NEWS: Apparently convinced that a network of dangerous foreign spies is operating within the United States, Federal authorities have mobilized the Government's various counter-espionage agencies to combat the menace.

The campaign is being conducted with strictest secrecy, but it has been announced that the recently augmented Federal Bureau of Investigation is bearing the brunt of the nation-wide investigation, aided by Army and Navy intelligence units and other Federal investigating bodies.

COMMENT: It is interesting to observe that intensification of the counter-espionage campaign comes at a time when the Administration has been assured of success in its attempt to repeal the arms embargo law. The coincidence is striking. In all the heated debates over revision of the Neutrality Act, isolationists have warned that the United States, by becoming an arsenal for the Allies, will invite reprisals from enemies of the Allies.

Led by Senator Borah, champion of true neutrality, isolationists have cautioned the Administration against exposing American factories and munition plants to a recurrence of the sabotage and bombings that marked the World War period and played an important part in baiting the United States into the conflict.

President Roosevelt, Key Pittman, Sol Bloom and the whole coterie of cash-and-carry addicts have scoffed at these danger signals. Nevertheless, the Government now has unleashed a vigorous attack against espionage and sabotage. J. Edgar Hoover's F.B.I. has engaged 150 new agents to strengthen the spy-detection activities of the bureau. Department of Treasury operatives, postal inspectors, border patrolmen and intelligence officers of the Army and Navy have been instructed to be most vigilant. Altogether a total of about 50,000 Federal agents are co-operating in the nation's greatest spy hunt.

We do not consider it rash speculation to venture that the Administration is well aware of the danger of selling war materials, especially when Britain and France, who control the seas, would be the only beneficiaries. The current anti-spy campaign seems to betray the Administration fears. It seems also to reveal that the Administration is preparing to combat the expected reprisals from Nazi spies when this country begins supplying the Allies with airplanes, arms and munitions under "neutrality" provisions which would deny Germany access to those materials.

The only real protection against sabotage and espionage in time of a European war is to take no part in the war — and that means sell *no* arms, munitions or implements of war to either side.

Bank of Canada and the War

THE NEWS: Premier Duplessis of Quebec has called a general election for Oct. 25, on the grounds that Ottawa's War Measures Act threatens the rights of his province.

COMMENT: The fight merits more than passing attention because, after Ontario, Quebec is the Dominion's richest and most populous province. The issue concerns a measure imposed on the people of Canada by the political minions of the privately-owned Bank of Canada, whose chief spokesman in the Ottawa Parliament is Ernest Lapointe, Federal Justice Minister. With two other Cabinet colleagues from Quebec, Lapointe has threatened to resign if Duplessis is vindicated at the polls.

Duplessis' party, the Union Nationale, is vehemently opposed to conscription of Quebec's man-power for a war "to save civilization and destroy Hitlerism." Claiming that this is just another empty slogan like "Save the World for Democracy," Duplessis thinks the question of conscription should be tested at the polls.

He knows, and the Bank of Canada knows, that the people of Quebec have no interest or enthusiasm with respect to the Weird War; and the bank's political supporters have done, and are doing, everything in their power to snag the Union Nationale's program.

The Bank of Canada has been the dynamo of a vicious campaign to smear Quebec's premier with the accusation of spendthrift policies. In reality it is the bank's own experts who devised the iniquitous Foreign Exchange Control Board, which has effectively denied the Quebec government credits sorely needed to carry on its administration. Likewise the bank has been able to persuade the Federal Reserve System against extending credit to Duplessis, despite the fact that there is no question of collateral being lacking.

Endorsers of N. A. B. Code Make Strange Bedfellows

The National Association of Broadcasters has released statements from a number of national organizations endorsing the new code which provides that controversial public discussions shall be barred from "paid time." Prominent among the organizations issuing commendatory statements were said to be the National Council of Catholic Men, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Some representative statements follow:

National Council of Catholic Men, Edward J. Heffron, Executive Secretary.

"The Code as it stands, without going into the vagaries of possible future interpretation, is in substance a splendid platform of democratic broadcasting. The fine conception of charity shown in ruling out 'attacks upon another's race or religion,' the fine conception of justice, indeed of social justice, shown in your effort to preclude the possibility of the interests with greater means monopolizing the time available for discussion of public controversial issues at the expense of interests just as important but poorer in this world's goods, deserve the highest commendation.

"I congratulate you and your Association upon the adoption of the Code, and I pray to God to give you the strength to see it to thorough and judicious execution."

American Civil Liberties Union, by Roger Baldwin, Director.

"The American Civil Liberties Union and its affiliate, the National Council on Freedom from Censorship, has followed and approved the sincere, persistent endeavors of the National Association of Broadcasters to make radio broadcasting a more socially-minded service. The Code adopted by the N.A.B. in July is a great step forward in formulating a policy in the public interest.

"We especially commend the resolve not to sell time for the discussion of controversial issues and to give time for such programs more generously and to open all such discussions to at least two opposing points of view. The assertion this week of this purpose and the redefinition of its concrete approach is further evidence of the intent of the N. A.B. to strengthen the spirit and method of these policies.

"We congratulate the N.A.B. and its membership on this forward-looking program."

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin
Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.
E. PERRIN SCHWARTZ, *Editor*

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.
Just living annual wage.
Nationalization of important public resources.
Private ownership of all other property.
Control of private property for public good.
Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a government-owned Central Bank.
Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.
Cost of living maintained on an even keel.
Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.
Labor's right to organize.
Recall of non-productive bonds.
Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.
Simplification of government and lower taxes.
Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.
Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with government's chief concern for the poor.

More Dangerous Than Lifting the Embargo

LET US LOOK A little more closely at this so-called neutrality bill. It seems to SOCIAL JUSTICE that the Pittman bill incorporated a lot of popular things that almost everybody wants, in order to carry along some "catch" provision that the war makers hope will be overlooked. Let us look for that.

For example, lifting the embargo on munitions—against which virtually all the debate is directed—is, perhaps, the least dangerous section of the whole bill. *The power that the rest of the bill puts in the hands of the President to get us into war is the dangerous part!* And a careful effort seems to have been made to keep that out of the discussion.

To get his desired war powers, the Washington correspondents say, the President would even waive the lifting of the arms embargo, except that such a concession would disclose the grim "joker."

Almost everybody is for shipping goods to belligerents in their own ships only.

Nearly everyone wants Americans to keep off ships of belligerents.

Nearly everyone opposes arming United States merchantmen.

Likewise, all are against allowing foreign governments to solicit funds for foreign causes in this country.

Lifting of the arms embargo and the granting of 90-day credits are the major provisions under discussion in Senate debate and in newspaper editorial columns.

But there has not been nearly enough daylight on the real danger spots. For example, Section 1 (a) reads:

"That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign States, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of the citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the States involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other States as and when they become involved in war."

The responsibility for making the proclamation is not definitely fixed by law either on the President or Congress. As for Congress, its members would not officially know unless so informed by the President, who is himself authorized to make the proclamation without Congress.

Under the proposed law, the President may or may not act to suit himself—as he does in the case of China and Japan. Or, he may act as against one or more groups of belligerents and not against their adversaries. Or, by not acting at all, the President can, under the proposed act, justify himself by "waiting for Congress to pass a joint resolution" that a state of war exists in China.

This situation is an unconstitutional delegation by Congress of its power to declare or not declare war, by indirection and practical effect to the President.

Section 2 (a) reads:

"Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of Section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or materials to any State named in the proclamation, except as to transportation on lakes, rivers and inland waters bordering on the United States, and as to transportation on or over lands bordering on the United States, which transportation shall be subject to such restrictions, rules and regulations as the President shall prescribe."

This gives the President sole war-declaring power, for he alone will have the power to define combat areas.

Section 2 (a) exempts outright all war materials carried across lakes and rivers. This makes lawful the carrying of war materials to Canada and Mexico. Thus, all railroads from the United States to Canada and Mexico, all trucks and all airplanes, might lawfully carry war materials.

If the advisors of the Administration wanted Congress to give the President *an act of war against Germany;* or wanted Congress to pass a law which gives Germany no other alternative than considering the United States as an appendix of Canada, Germany's declared enemy; or put us into war with Italy via the Mexican route, and, of course, including Mexico—they could not have framed a better trap!

Representatives Revolt

ADMINISTRATION LEADERS have awakened to the fact that while they have concentrated on the Senate, "blacking out" the House of Representatives by a high-handed parliamentary trick, there has been brewing a veritable revolution against warmongering dictatorship within the people's Congress.

Responsive to thousands of letters from the American people, numerous Congressmen prepared to support the Senate isolationists, only to discover that they were to be given no opportunity for debate at all.

Whereupon, so our Washington correspondents report, some 40 determined Representatives called upon Speaker Bankhead. Their conversation is not of record, but you can wager that it went something like this:

The Boys: "We understand that the rule of cloture is to be invoked and that we are to have but 12 hours to debate a committee resolution on neutrality."

Speaker Bankhead: "That's about it."

The Boys: "Well, we're here to tell you that we do not need any 12 hours; all we want is 12 minutes; In that 12 minutes we are going to tell the American people that the responsibility for lifting the embargo, with all that comes after it, is not the responsibility of their Congressmen but of the Administration itself. . . ."

Speaker: "Wait a minute, fellows, wait a minute. You can't do that."

The Boys: "Who says we can't?"

Speaker: "Well, hold it up, won't you, till I see the Chief?"—or words to that effect.

And the word came back that *"the Chief" says they can talk about it for two weeks if they want to.*

That left the Congressmen more puzzled than ever. Are we so definitely committed to war that the President was willing to let neutrality drag another two weeks so that Congress would share the responsibility? Are the future consequences of lifting the arms embargo so clear to the Administration that it does not want to bear the sole responsibility?

A lot can happen in two weeks. The United States is "overdue" now. The "plan" was, so they whisper, that we were to lift the embargo by October 1, make a great show about keeping out of war between now and Armistice Day, and then get into it along about the April anniversary of the last one!

But another two weeks of uncertainty of what America is going to do about neutrality is almost more than the jittery nerves of Europeans can stand. To fight or not to fight, that's the question that will not be put off much longer. If they cannot count on the United States they will have to call their phony war off; if they can be sure that America is in, the fight is on. The European picture is almost as simple as that. Have you been wondering why they don't start the real war? **The answer is that your letters to Congress have held up the plans of the war makers.**

Why Cash-and-Carry

THE AMERICAN IRON and Steel Institute discloses some most pertinent facts which throw a mighty question mark before the proposal of Cash-and-Carry.

Says this Institute:

"England, France, Germany and Poland have been among the chief steel-exporting countries since January, 1936. Total exports of steel from those countries amounted to an annual average of 6,999,000 gross tons during the period, somewhat more than half of the aggregate of world exports of steel. . . .

"The total tonnage of steel exported by England, France, Germany and Poland from January, 1936, through June, 1939, was nearly four times the amount of steel exported from the United States during the same period and is equivalent to 23 per cent of the total output of steel for sale by steel industry of the United States during the period. . . ."

The article explains further that about 83 per cent of the total tonnage of steel exported by the above named countries went to nations with inadequate steel producing facilities.

In times of peace, the Allies trim us at every move in exporting to foreign countries. They undersell us; they juggle their money to circumvent us; they paralyze our factories and create an army of idle men in America. Why is it that, in times of war, they want to use us as their steel producer, as their airplane builder, as their munition manufacturer?

When peace comes, after a year or so, will our State Department and our Government in general slide back to the old way of doing things and let the foreign nations keep on taking us for another foreign-export ride until it is time for the next ride?

The steel industry is a depression baby. Between 1925 and 1938, in a period of peace-time depression and idle workmen, the steel industry wrote off $360-million indebtedness, a reduction which amounted to some $32-million a year in bond interest alone.

What of the injustice of an industry that profits both in war and depression—which reaps new highs for its wealthy bondholders in peace-time depressions when the workers are least able to bear the burden and allures them with a phantom of prosperity in war time?

World's Fare

The plight of a certain Washington politician is sad, indeed. He protests that for two weeks now he has been "trying to get past Roosevelt to see Corcoran."

* * *

News dispatch says White House illumination facilities may be improved. Hence, after 7 years, New Deal occupants and visitors may see light.

* * *

A business leader told the Associated Press recently that "the maintenance of business improvement beyond the remainder of this year will depend upon the degree to which the inventories now being accumulated move into consumption." This sage observation compares most favorably with the famous pronouncement that when large numbers of men are rendered jobless a situation of unemployment results.

* * *

Headline says: "U. S. Acts in Finn-Soviet Crisis." This is no time for histrionics.

* * *

France has packed the luxurious furnishings of the Normandie in mothballs. Which might be a good treatment for national leaders who lead their countrymen into useless wars.

* * *

Earl Browder, William Z. Foster and the Communist Party have slapped a $2-million libel suit against Liberty magazine. We contend it is impossible to libel the Communist Party.

* * *

The Communist *Daily Worker* predicted "cooler weather" for New York last week. The next day the temperature arose to a record-breaking 83 mark.

* * *

Jimmy Roosevelt reduced himself to a captain's rank in the United States Marines because his lieutenant-colonel rank was "too high for my age and experience." But it's still a high rank for an airplane salesman.

* * *

Financial statement, New York World's Fair: Cost: $155-million. Outstanding bonds: $24-million. Cash on hand: $500,000. Bond payments to be made this year: none. Prospect: blackout.

* * *

Poor Mr. J. P. Morgan! The war has limited his activities so much, he complains, that now he is permitted to telephone the Bank of England only concerning problems arising out of international banking.

Friends and Neighbors

SOME TIME AGO it was necessary for Father Coughlin to make a pronouncement over the airways disavowing any association with an organization known as the Christian Mobilizers.

From time to time organizations make public claim that their reason for existence is to help Father Coughlin.

It is necessary to advise the public that Friends and Neighbors, an organization now existing in several states, has no relation whatsoever to Father Coughlin, insofar as he sponsors it, applauds it or receives any financial assistance from it to carry on his most expensive work of broadcasting.

The organization, likely, is motivated by high ideals. So are a thousand other organizations. Nevertheless, it is necessary for us to make this point clear that none of these organizations have any right to seek the support of individuals on the basis that by supporting some organization they are supporting Father Coughlin.

Father Coughlin cannot be identified with the meetings or objectives of any group; he cannot afford to be limited by the circumference of any organization. He speaks for all the people as individuals and is supported by the people only as individuals. If any club desires to send any contribution to Father Coughlin let their chairman first obtain a letter signed by Father Coughlin and bearing a date later than the appearance of this notice.

FROM THE TOWER

The Neutrality Bill

The First Step to Communism

[From the Broadcast of Sunday, October 15. Complete copies may be obtained by writing directly to Father Coughlin, Royal Oak, Michigan.]

THE NEUTRALITY BILL debate still engages the attention of the nation. Both the Administration forces and their opponents equally profess their concern for keeping America out of war. It appears, however, that only one group of Senators is interested in keeping war out of America.

Keeping America out of war and keeping war out of America are two related but distinct problems. In the light of the Dies Committee reports; in the light of our experience with certain labor leaders and subversive organizations whom we have pampered officially, probably the problem of keeping war out of America is worthy of as much consideration as keeping America out of war.

Both problems are related to lifting the embargo on arms, munitions and instruments of destruction. Both are related to Communism. Both are associated not only with the millions of red and brown troops marshaled north of the Siegfried line, but with the troops in overalls, in white collars and uniforms now honeycombing the factories, offices and public service departments of America. No swastika, no hammer and sickle identifies them. Nevertheless, these enemies within our gates — ready to serve their totalitarian master, ready to strike for world revolution—are not receiving the proper attention from those who are supporting the lifting of the embargo on arms on a cash-and-carry basis as the best means for keeping America out of war. This policy, eventually, may be the best means for getting war into America, and for paving the way for Communism

Over and above other considerations—as important as they are—is the problem of fighting Communism; of fighting it successfully; of keeping it from America.

Now that Hitler's political star has been eclipsed by the Red star of Russia, there are those in our midst who tell us that it is time to rush to the assistance of Britain and France to insure the defeat of Communism abroad.

A surface judgment might suggest that we not only lift the embargo but throw all our resources on the side of the Allies, careless of what happens inside America

Deeper reflection, however, suggests that the passage of the present Neutrality Act with its lifting of the embargo may defeat our very purpose and bring about the dreaded results abroad and at home which every sane person fears to contemplate.

As matters stand, Great Britain, France and the United States are the three chief capitalist units of government in the world. The three of them, while naturalistic in their attitude towards religion and God, are neither anti-God nor anti-Christ. They stand united not by reason of their liberal attitude towards religion, else they would include Fascistic Italy and Fascistic Spain, but by reason of their common economic system which we define as international capitalism.

Enemies Within Anxious for War

Russia and Germany, the anti-capitalistic States, will be disappointed if the war does not continue and if the United States does not enter this conflict at least indirectly. These anti-capitalist nations are well prepared to fight the capitalist nations. Already their armies have invaded England, France and America. They are prepared to wreck our industries, to bomb our factories and to create havoc among our civilian populations.

These invisible armies are anxious to begin operations in America, if we lift the embargo The reason for this is obvious Stalin and Hitler know the repercussions which will follow in all capitalist nations at the termination of the war They know that, in capitalist nations, factories do not operate except on the basis of the profit system They know that these factories will be shut down following the war They know idle factories and idle men will generate a tremendous political upheaval

Stalin and Hitler even anticipate the reaction which will result not only in England, France and America, but also in Germany, even though Germany is defeated. In every case it will be a revolutionary reaction against government, industry, finance and religion. It will be a reaction against the profit system and all those who uphold it. It will be a reaction against private ownership of industry

The vulture of the Kremlin will not suffer, even though Germany loses, for he knows that no nation will win. He will withdraw behind his frontiers unharmed and unscathed, conscious that no battalions can pursue him; conscious that his Bolshevism will have spread like wildfire in the capitalistic countries.

Britain, France and America may be motivated to enter this war, directly or indirectly, to save their economic system. But Stalin, who engineered the war, is already certain that a war will insure the spread of his Communism. He alone can be the winner. The capitalist countries surely will be the losers.

It is my contention, therefore, that if we pass the present Neutrality Bill, including the lifting of the embargo, we will invite war and Communism into America. We will accomplish the very thing planned by the enemies of capitalism.

* * *

Abuses of Capitalism Generate Communism

I believe that the best way to protect the institutions of honest profit, private enterprise and private ownership, is to hold fast to the embargo and to notify the world that we cannot engage in this conflict until Great Britain and France and America, first, will have liquidated Communism, each within its own borders, by destroying the causes which create Communism.

Premier Daladier of France is to be congratulated for outlawing that menace. However, he has not gone far enough. *No nation can outlaw Communism until it outlaws the causes which create it.* No nation can rid itself of Stalin's secret army within its shores until it eradicates the causes which win friends for Stalin.

Dictator Threat Overshadows Embargo

Probably all of us have over-emphasized the menace of lifting the embargo as contained in the Administration's Neutrality Bill. Probably all of us have under-estimated the menace of dictatorial powers which this same bill grants to the President of the United States. The whole Neutrality Bill is shot through with powers of an undemocratic, unconstitutional nature. Now, the international capitalists planned it that way. They know that "democracy" must be liquidated to save their gold racket and money dictatorship.

The only escape for Americans from a "total" war, with all its implications and its loss of civil liberties as well as financial liberties, is in a *total* neutrality act, even though our present financial structure must suffer. A total neutrality act at least will save the lives of American boys. A total neutrality act will keep America out of war and war out of America. A total neutrality act will force the statesmen of France and Britain to search for a temporary peace to initiate and pursue to completion a new economic program within their own nations A total neutrality act, barring the shipment of arms and munitions and money to belligerents, will force Britain and France to abandon the old program of international capitalism which produced want in times of peace and piled up undue profits in the hands of a few in times of war

We capitalist nations have been slow in removing the abuses of capitalism. We have been reluctant to dissolve the economic causes which generate Communism. We have been opposed to the establishment of a system of production for use at a profit. Britain, France and America still cling to their financial imperialism based upon debt money with its resultant exploitation of hundreds of millions of people.

As a result of this, we have been weakening our own morale: the people no longer have any desire to fight commercial wars for the benefits of profiteers, international bankers and international capitalists whose economic system have not only impoverished and distressed them but has reached the point of decadence where it produces a semblance of prosperity only through war and debts. We want peace and we want an economic system that produces prosperity in times of peace.

* * *

Nation in No Condition to Invite a War

A keen student of propaganda, Mr. O. W. Riegal, has said: "If one wishes to bet on the outcome of the propaganda conflict in this country in the event of an international crisis, he would be wise to lay his money against neutrality and peace."

This gentleman's observation is supported by a Senate Committee document which details—at least in part—the silent, powerful pro-war influence of the exploiting international classes. Over a period of eighteen months, prior to 1935, the sum of $1,084,604.62 was spent on war propaganda by the following organizations: (For the full exposition of this, I refer you to *"Preface to Chaos"* by C. Hartley Grattan, page 190.)

American Liberty League
American Federation of Utility Investors
American Taxpayers League
Crusaders
Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy
Farmers Independence Council
League for Industrial Rights
Minute Men and Women of Today
National Economy League
New York State Economic Council
Repeal Associates
Sentinels of the Republic
Southern Committee to Uphold the Constitution
Women Investors of America, Inc.

Among the individuals and firms making this contribution, approximately ninety per cent of it originated from the following sources:

du Pont family	$204,045
du Pont associates	152,622
Pitcairn family	100,250
J. P. Morgan associates	68,226
Mellon associates	60,752
Rockefeller associates	49,852
Hutton (E. F.) associates	40,671
Sun Oil associates	37,260
Banks and Brokers	184,224
Utilities companies and associates	27,069
TOTAL	$929,974

Many of these corporations profited considerably during the World War. The Morgan Corporation alone, according to the Nye Committee, handled over $3-billion; the du Pont corporation alone had contracts in excess of $429-million. It is to be hoped that, in this crisis, these corporations and associations will see the handwriting on the wall and alter their policies to save themselves, our country and our civilization.

To my mind, this is an inopportune time to engage in fighting the anti-capitalist nations abroad, because too many citizens in Britain, France and the United States have been and still are victims of the abuses of capitalism; and as such, will be glad to seize the first reasonable opportunity to destroy it in its entirety. To my mind, if we encourage Britain and France to proceed with this destructive war, we are doing these Empires a disservice by inviting upon them, and ourselves, the curses of Communism.

* * *

Communists Hope for World Revolt

Possibly I am a pessimist; I hope so. Nevertheless, I lean to the belief that a general war waged at this present moment will be disastrous for all — particularly disastrous for the financialist, the industrialist, the politician, and all others who are well known and who will be held personally responsible before the tribunal of an angry populace not only for the first step leading to a total war, but for the unnecessary miseries about to be foisted upon the world.

Ever since the promulgation of Communism, its leaders have preached world revolution. Many of them have expressed the idea that the best way to bring this about was through the medium af war

Do not underestimate the enemies of democracy and capitalism. They are powerful and fanatic. They have tasted victory They have trampled over Poland, they have circumscribed Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland. They are buoyed up by the Browders in America, the Blums in France, the Lord Marleys in England. They are conscious that revolutionary situations have been created in all the democratic, capitalistic countries. They recognize that this is the time to strike.

Therefore, my friends, I ask you in the face of these facts to make one more heroic effort this week. If your Representative is now at home, visit him. Ask him to put patriotism above partyism. If your Representative is at Washington, contact him. Encourage him to oppose the "gag rule," which is being imposed upon him. Implore him to keep America out of power politics. Petition him not to let this country—its wealth, its youth, its entire population, its religion and its liberty—become the cat's-paw for the international capitalists.

Probably this will be your last opportunity; for if the present Neutrality Bill is passed there is no more guarantee for free speech or free discussion in this land; there is no more democracy; and there is no use struggling to hold ourselves free from the network of European intrigue.

Father Coughlin

From Abroad

The Finns at Bay: Will Hitler Help?

Stalin's Threat to Expand on High Seas Gives All Powers Cause to Worry

THE NEWS: Having subjugated half of Poland and the three Baltic sister-States Josef Stalin last week struck westward once more. Choosing Finland as his next victim, he sent a ukase to Helsingfors and immediately Juko Paasiviki, former Finnish premier, entrained for Moscow.

One more non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union was drawn up, and Finland was given the choice of surrendering peacefully or going to war against the largest army on earth.

By the week-end neither the terms of the pact nor the final decision of Finland were known—although Helsingfors did announce that it would fight before capitulating. Moscow mouthpieces indicated the basis of Russia's demands would be annexation of the Aaland Islands, which rise in the strait between Finland and Sweden, and thereby command all the Baltic's sea lanes, save those now under Germany's coast artillery.

Whatever the outcome of negotiations, one thing seemed certain. Finland dispatched 25,000 troops to the Russian frontier and thus gave warning that Helsingfors was ready for the worst.

COMMENT: The Great Aggressor's insult to Finland put an entirely new complexion on the Weird War. Until Stalin's insolent ukase, warfare had consisted chiefly of the diplomaniacs' battle cries and the eclipse of four Slavic dictatorships by the combined action of German force and Russian threat.

This time, however, there came a threat to a nation which is a democracy in the real sense of the word. Finland, moreover, is the gateway to Scandinavia, that region where men and women live more like human beings than anywhere else.

There are no dictators in the northern countries. There are no food-razing New Dealers; no Hollywood culture vultures; no unemployment purgatory. The transplanting of Communism to such a soil would constitute a disaster for Christianity and the world.

Finland, a former Czarist Grand Duchy, has had a taste of Marxist revolution. Its 60,000 lakes were stained with blood in 1918, when the unspeakable Trotzky (now our neighbor in Mexico) instigated a Bolshevik revolt that was put down only after a German expeditionary force had fought desperately by the side of Finland's hard-pressed natives.

No Hope of Help From Great Britain

Today the fatherland of Paavo Nurmi and countless other model athletes and Christians finds itself in about the same predicament as it did 21 years ago. The Finnish army is now 50,000 strong but now, as before, it cannot hope to resist the Soviet tidal wave unless it receives aid from the West.

Who shall aid the peace-loving, orderly, progressive-planning, superlatively clean and God-fearing Finns?

Shall it be Mr. Chamberlain and Monsieur Daladier, the straw-stuffed dictators of the West's two pseudo-democracies? *Non, merci!* Britain and France, who signed a trade agreement with Brother Stalin last week, will not raise their hands against the mighty Bear whom they still fondly hope will triple-cross Hitler and come over to their side.

Would help then come from Denmark, Sweden and Norway? Denmark is almost a German province. Despite a well-armed military complement, Sweden could not give the Finns much help. In fact, Sweden and Norway might well have to pit their entire strength in a desperate defense against the Russian onslaught.

Finns Depend on U. S. and Hitler

And so the distracted Finns last week were looking to Germany, their rescuer of 1918, and to the United States, toward whom these simple people look with an admiration that virtually amounts to devotion.

Only Adolf Hitler, they believe, is in a position to tell the Russians directly to keep out of Scandinavia and all last week they waited in vain for such a caution. They knew that Hitler must be considering this sombre picture: Stalin master of Scandinavia means Stalin wielding the balance of power in the Baltic and North Seas, as he wields it today on land. And Russian development on the high seas would deal a terrific blow to Germany's naval and commercial competition with Britain. Yet Berlin had not moved; and the world wondered what further treachery the two Devil's disciples could be concocting.

But Washington did move. Remembering that the Finns have been the only people in Europe to make good on their war debt payments, President Roosevelt, Thursday, sent Moscow a note warning against further meddling in Finland's "internal affairs."

The secret diplomacy now being conducted in the Orient is more than another example of British and French treachery to weak nations—it is a dangerous threat to the safety and security of the United States! Freed from their military campaign in China, the empire-hungry war lords of Japan will be able to turn East and proceed with their avowed purpose of chasing the United States navy from the Pacific.

End of China; A Warning to Us

THE NEWS: The twenty-eighth anniversary of Chinese independence—celebrated last week throughout all non-Japanese China—promised to be the last. Britain withdrew five gunboats from the Yangtze river, stopped supporting Chinese currency in its battle with the devalued Japanese yen and had a French delegate warn the fugitive Chinese Foreign Ministry to make peace with Japan.

In London, Sir Stafford Cripps, former Labor Party leader, let the secret out when he told Chinese diplomats to expect the re-establishment of the former Anglo-Japanese alliance, broken off at America's insistence shortly after the World War.

COMMENT: Thus the recent history of Poland may be repeated on a vaster scale. Having promised China military and financial assistance, the Allies are now preparing to abandon that nation in the midst of its death struggle with Japan. Wang Ching-wei, the Chinese renegade, was in Shanghai last week drawing up peace terms which will set up a Japanese puppet state from the Yellow Sea to Western China.

'That's the Chap Who Pays His Debts'

—Elderman-Washington Post

Eli, Eli . . .

PARIS—The new Polish government in exile got off to a good start last week. Premier Sikorski attended special services in the Great Synagogue of Paris with Baron Robert de Rothschild.

Skeletons

Here are some of the better post-1919 skeletons rattling in the diplomaniac cupboards of the three powers that have been playing ring-around-the-rosie on the Western Front:

Germany:

Spent from 1919 to 1933 complaining against the Versailles Treaty and evaded many of its provisions.

Spent from 1933 to 1939 tearing up the Treaty of Versailles.

Decreed military conscription, 1935.

Occupied the Rhineland in violation of the Locarno Treaty, 1936.

Invaded and annexed Austria, 1938.

Sliced off a portion of Czecho-Slovakia, 1938.

Invaded and annexed the remainder of Czecho-Slovakia, 1939.

Took Memel from Lithuania by extortion, 1939.

Started, according to the best information available at present, a new world war, 1939.

France:

Blocked every effort to induce the victorious powers to disarm, as promised in the Treaty of Versailles, 1919 to 1933.

Carried an economic war upon prostrate Germany, 1919-29.

Dominated the League of Nations which put seal of approval upon Polish seizures of Silesia in 1921 and Wilno in 1924.

Occupied the Ruhr valley of Germany on thin reparations pretext, 1923, with Prime Minister Poincaire privately expressing hope the Germans would not pay so France could annex the valley.

Unofficially supported Japanese invasion of Manchuria until realizing her stand was undermining her own insistence upon sanctity of the Versailles Treaty, 1931.

Blocked effective sanctions against Italy when latter invaded Ethiopia, 1935.

Sacrificed Czecho-Slovakia to appeasement policy, 1938.

Violated Syrian mandate by letting Turks take district of Hatay in deal for Anglo-Franco-Turkish alliance, 1939.

Defaulted on war debts to United States up to and including the present time.

Britain:

Carried on intermittent bombing of tribes on Northwest frontier of India, 1920-1939.

Supported Japan against United States at time of Manchurian invasion, 1931.

Failed to deal effectively with Italian aggression in Ethiopia, 1935.

Sacrificed Czecho-Slovakia to appeasement policy, 1938.

Broke Balfour promise of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, 1938-1939.

Defaulted on war debts to United States up to and including the present time.

Q.—What's a Neutral? A.—It all Depends . . .

THE BRITISH are openly gloating over the fact that President Roosevelt has refused to invoke the embargo against Russia, although he has invoked it against Germany.

For the record: Brother Stalin's recent real estate acquisitions by the threat of force include 75,000 square miles of Poland and the whole of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, or 61,000 square miles. This is a grand total of 139,000 square miles and, of course, does not include those portions of Finland, China, Afghanistan, Roumania, or what not, which the Soviet Union may have acquired by the time SOCIAL JUSTICE comes off the press.

At any rate, since the war started Moscow has seized almost twice as much territory as has Germany. Yet Mr. Roosevelt, by his action on the embargo, slavishly accepts the miserable Chamberlain-Daladier thesis that German aggression is a crime, Russian aggression just another form of neutrality.

That America should participate in this diplomaniac hypocrisy constitutes the low point of a foreign policy that for some years now has been tripping the light fantastic in the juke-joints of the New Deal's Lunatic Fringe.

Treaty Breakers

France Makes Deal on Her Own

Illegal Cession of Alexandretta to Turkey Ignores Rights of Other Powers

By Dr. J. S. Barnes
(Special European Correspondent for SOCIAL JUSTICE)

FRANCE HAS at last fulfilled, though very reluctantly, the most important provisions of the *Jordana-Berard Agreement* by which she came unconditionally to recognize Nationalist Spain—namely, the return of $40-million in gold held by the Bank of France. This action was chiefly owing to the threat of resignation by that grand and honest old soldier, Marshal Petain, who is France's ambassador in Spain.

The remaining $750-million stolen by the Reds has, unfortunately, been dissipated beyond recovery; though much of it is known to have found its way, not only into the French treasury in return for munitions, but also into the pockets of French politicians.

France has now also returned, in accordance with the terms of the agreement, the greater part of the Church treasure and plate stolen from private homes and museums, *including the loot carried off by Senor Dr. Negrin in 33 large wooden cases!*

Motor Cars Returned As So Much Scrap

France, however, would have cut a better figure had she carried out her obligations in a generous and spontaneous spirit instead of haggling over every item. Even so, every one of the 3,000-odd motor vehicles which have been returned to Spain up to the present moment has been returned as so much scrap iron, though they passed into France in good condition.

Thus, the French have observed the letter, but scarcely the spirit, of their treaty. And the same applies to the guns which France engaged herself to return. The antiquated material has come back. The new, which might be of use to the French army, has all mysteriously disappeared. So has the cattle!

All of this is not much to the honor of France, especially as she and her ally, Great Britain, are constantly claiming to be the upholders of the stipulated word, as against Germany and Italy, whom they always stigmatize as the "treaty-breakers."

France, nevertheless, in connivance with Great Britain, has recently added yet another flagrant breach of treaty to the list already far too long since 1914—namely, the cession of Alexandretta to Turkey.

France Illegally Cedes Mandate Area

This was the price of Turkey's adherence to the Anglo-French alliance against Germany and Italy. But France had no right whatever to change the status of this territory, correctly known as "the Hatay," without the consent of Italy, as well as of Britain.

The exact, indisputable legal situation is the following:

The Hatay formed part of the Syrian mandate accorded to France by the Allied powers jointly, and to whom it was ceded.

Thus, France, acting as mandatory, could not cede territory in which she exerted powers only of a temporary adviser under Article 22 of the mandate. France possessed no territorial rights whatever over the district. Nor could the League of Nations frank her action, since the League also has no territorial rights, either in the Hatay or anywhere else. The League was never put into possession of any soil and its role in the mandatory areas is merely to see that a mandate is carried out in accordance with the mandate's own terms.

France, in other words, has arrogated to herself rights which she only held in common with all those other powers who contributed to the defeat of Turkey in the World War. Turkey, in fact, made no cession of territory to any individual power of the 1914-18 Allies, but to all of them together.

Protest by Italy Will Be Disregarded

On this point, therefore, the recent Italian protest is based on incontrovertible legal foundations. The departure of Italy from the League has no effect upon it, for it is as a member of the Alliance and not as a member of the League that the claim is made.

Of course, Italy's protest will be disregarded and British propaganda will see to it that the whole incident passes off without the truth ever being known to a large public.

Here, much more than in the case of Albania, has a change of the *status quo* been effected in the Mediterranean. For, whatever else may be said about it, the independence of Albania was not the subject of any treaty binding Italy, while it is clear that the new situation brought about in Albania was the result of an invitation to Italy to intervene.

Great Britain, accordingly, has lost by her acquiescence in this overt act by France all right to pontificate to the rest of the world about the sanctity of treaties.

It is also extremely ironical to observe that, whereas France has never fulfilled her obligations under the *Treaty of London* (1915), by which she promised colonial expansion to Italy, and to Italian claims, invariably responds with a "Never—not one inch of French soil!"—she has shown herself perfectly willing to break another treaty with Italy involving the surrender of other people's territory.

MARSHAL PETAIN
His threat to resign as ambassador to National Spain shamed France into reluctantly returning stolen Spanish wealth.

George Bernard Shaw Says 'War Is Over!'

One of the most common-sense comments on Europe's war that has come to attention in recent days was that of Mr. George Bernard Shaw, England's foremost satirist. His article in the "New Statesman" of London was distributed in this country by the enterprising King Features Syndicate.

THE WAR IS OVER, declares Mr. Shaw in as many words. "Every person in the country capable of seeing three moves ahead in the game of military chess has known this from the moment when the first Russian soldier stepped across the Polish frontier," the British author observes.

The British, he says, shamelessly threw their pledge to Poland to the winds. The Poles, he adds, should have known that England could not put a single soldier into Poland, or a single ship into the Baltic, until England had conquered Germany—a conquest that the most optimistic forecasters admit would require at least three years.

Poland was deceived by assurances that, if Hitler laid hand on Poland, the British *would attack with all their resources*, and the only obvious resource was the British air force.

Says Mr. Shaw:

"This was understood by the Poles to mean exactly what it did mean: That at 11 o'clock on the third of September, we should dispatch all our bombers to smash up the Rhine cities and Berlin, as Madrid and Warsaw had been smashed up; but with the all-important difference that, although Madrid and Warsaw could no more retaliate than the Abyssinians or the Northwest hill tribes, Germany could immediately play a hailstone chorus on London and all of our provincial centers. . . .

"It is, I repeat, to our eternal credit that when it came to this point and we were faced with the responsibility of initiating such a suicidal climax of human villainy, we funked it . . .

"In vain Poland called on us to treat German cities as Warsaw was being treated," Mr. Shaw goes on. "Our reply was to drop a packet of tracts on them.

"Thus betrayed, Poland surrendered and laid herself at Hitler's feet. . . . Whereupon we threw off the mask of knight-errantry and avowed flatly that we didn't care two hoots about Poland and were out on our own balance of power lines to disable Germany, which we now called *abolishing Hitlerism!*"

Whereupon, Mr. Shaw very appropriately suggests that his England begin by "abolishing Churchillism."

"We are told," says he, "that if we don't send Hitler to St. Helena he will proceed to annex Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, England, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Africa and finally the entire universe. . . . Had we better not wait until Hitler tries to do it and then stop him with Stalin and Roosevelt at our back?"

"I write without responsibility," concludes the always independent Mr Shaw, "because I represent nobody but myself and a handful of despised and politically powerless intellectuals capable of taking a catholic view of the situation."

Incidentally, Mr. Shaw sees America's neutrality as "pro-British," just as England's own non-intervention in the Spanish civil war was pro-Franco.

Soviet Boastful of Its Conquest

AN EDITORIAL in *Izvestia*, the Soviet government newspaper, declares that to continue the war on the basis of restoring Poland would mean a "senseless slaughter," and that for Great Britain and France to fight to crush Hitlerism would be "criminal political folly."

"Even the blind can now see that the Polish State cannot be restored in its former shape and on its former territory," the editorial continues, and adds:

"One may respect or hate Hitlerism, just as any other system of political views. This is a matter of taste. But to undertake war for the 'annihilation of Hitlerism' means to commit an act of criminal folly in politics."

Thus the greatest disaster to civilization in this European war was not the invasion of Poland by Germany, ***but the Communistic-Asiatic advance of Red Russia into Christian Europe!***

"Soviet Russia is Communizing eastern Poland as fast as the Red army advances into what was Poland," reports Melvin K. Whiteleather, Associated Press correspondent at Brest-Litovsk.

Stalin's forces have already seized all Polish factories for the "proletariat"; the partition of large rural estates has been ordered; and propaganda trucks have spread out in all directions over the portions of Poland that have fallen to the invading Asiatics.

"Communist commissars are in the van of this Asiatic army over-running eastern Europe," writes this correspondent, "and the commanding officer is not the master in his own house; *a political commissar must nod assent before anything not strictly strategic can be carried out, even at the front!*"

Thus the world sees in Poland, not so much a Russian conquest, but, as the *New York Journal* observes, "a Communistic conquest!"

Communism at last has come to Christian Europe. Poland, the Christian bulwark against an atheistic Asia has fallen. Germany, the hoped-for Christian champion against Bolshevism, is, for the moment, Bolshevism's comrade in arms. This is more significant even than Poland's loss of nationalism. Not only the fate of Poland but of all western Europe is at stake! The menace is not Hitler, but Stalin!

Atheism, confiscation and the sword of class hatred move swiftly. The program of Stalin and the fanatics out of Asia is universal conquest. Hitler, forced into alliance with the Kremlin, paved the way for advances of Communism from the East that are a far worse menace to the world than any possible menace from Germany.

The Red Front

Split in N. Y. Labor

Hillman and Dubinsky Endanger Jewry with Tactics Learned in Russia

From a Staff Correspondent

NEW YORK — The New York political scene, always kaleidoscopic, always confused, is fast approaching a state of chaos. Upon the signing of the Nazi-Red non-aggression pact last month, Jewish labor leaders launched a far-reaching purge of Communists within the ranks of the American Labor Party and affiliated organizations.

The campaign gathered force two weeks ago with the introduction of a resolution by Alex Rose, Labor Party chieftain, calling for the condemnation of all forms of dictatorship including Stalinism. After a bitter fight the measure was approved by a vote of 605 to 94. Meanwhile, City Councilman Michael J. Quill, head of the C.I.O. Transport Workers Union and influential Labor Party chieftain, refused to support the resolution and announced he would seek re-election on an "independent ticket," which will be backed by his Communist supporters.

The split in the American Labor Party is being hailed by many as a rejection of Communism and a return to the principles of sane, democratic unionism. The balance of power, however, has merely passed from the Red Communists to the Red Trotzkyites and Marxists. If anything, Jewish control of the Labor Party has been strengthened rather than diminished. Alex Rose, David Dubinsky, George Backer and Sidney Hillman—all Jews — no longer have to face the boring from within tactics of the Communists and can rule unopposed. Evidence of how this rule will be carried out was furnished by a Labor Party resolution demanding the repeal of the arms embargo clause of the Neutrality Act.

The drive against Reds in the American Labor Party leaves the forces of New York City radicalism divided into four major camps. Next in importance to the Labor Party itself comes the Communists, followed by Leon Trotzky's Socialist-Labor group. Bringing up the rear is the debiliated Socialist Party of Norman Thomas which struggles along as best it can in such ultra-radical company.

All four of these parties expound the doctrines of Karl Marx. While they seem to be at each other's throats like a pack of ravening jackals, they all have the same end in mind—world Communism.

Sacrificial Goat on the Marxian Altar

Commanding over ½-million votes in New York State, the American Labor Party has attained the status of a major party. It represents an amalgamation of "liberal" and radical elements in New York's population — workers in the garment trades, middle-class Socialists and social workers, Communists, the poorer elements among the Italians and Negroes and, finally, a majority of the Jewish voters in New York City.

While the rank and file of the party are honestly striving to better their economic condition, its recognized leaders, especially David Dubinsky and Sidney Hillman, are dangerous fanatics bent on sabotaging Christian American labor. The New York City Jew is the sacrificial goat for the Marxian altar; led by rabble-rousing co-racialists, Jews have flocked to the standards of a party which is nothing but a front for the Reds.

Time and again the Jewish people have been drawn into movements led by fanatical dreamers seeking to emulate Genghis Kahn, who swept through Asia and Europe on a bloody path of world conquest.

American Jews should carefully examine the men who now pretend to lead them. Dubinsky and Hillman have not entered the American political scene totally inexperienced in the intricacies of revolution. Before they accepted the hospitality of America, these two Jewish leaders left records of black treachery to their fellows in Czarist Russia.

The Record of Jew Against Jew

Of the two, Dubinsky is the more inflammatory. At the early age of 14 he was a member of the Jewish Workingman's Bund, an underground anarchist movement aimed at the overthrow of the Czar. It was uprisings fomented by this and affiliated groups that brought on the horrifying pogrom of November, 1905.

Hillman was also active in the 1905 disorders. After the killings in Odessa, early in November of that year, American Jewish organizations castigated those of their race, including Hillman and Dubinsky, who were the immediate cause of the pogrom.

In the November, 1905, issue of *The Menorah*, a family publication for Jews, the following statement appeared: "There seems to be no doubt that there is a large proportion of Jews among the Socialists and revolutionaries and that they took their full share in the attacks on the bureaucrats and (Czarist) police. . . . In Kremenchug, on November 3, there was a clash between Loyalists (Czarist soldiers) and revolutionaries, among the latter many Jews. . . . In Warsaw the Jewish militia killed four disguised detectives." The magazine observed that this gave the Czarist police an excuse to foment intensification of the pogrom.

The periodical further described celebrations of the revolution of 1905 by Jewish radical organizations, which ended in race riots costing thousands of lives. In Reval, Dubinsky's fellow-Bundists extorted 7,500 rubles by threatening to burn the city to the ground.

A terrible vengeance was wreaked on the innocent Jews of Russia for the excesses of their radical brothers. Czarist authorities lifted restrictions on ignorant Russian peasants and city laborers when the revolutionists forced the Imperial government to grant a constitution. Unaccustomed to their new liberties, the inflamed mobs turned on the hated Jews, killing, mutilating, burning and beating them

DUBINSKY

HILLMAN

without regard to age or sex. Not only did the police and Cossacks refuse to intervene, they joined the rioters and looted the Jewish quarters in practically every large Russian city. In Odessa alone there were nearly 10,000 Jews stabbed, shot or burned to death.

This terrible background, in which the present leaders of the American Labor Party had a part, has been reconstructed from dispatches carried in Jewish periodicals published at the time of the revolution and the ensuing pogroms. New York City Jews, who are contemplating joining the Dubinsky-Hillman axis, may read further details in their own New York Public Library.

Both False Prophets Come from Russia

David Dubinsky was born in the Ghetto of Brest-Litovsk, Russian Poland, in 1892. He was third of five children of an Orthodox Jewish family. When he was 3, his family moved to Lodz, where his father opened a bakery. He received a fair education, graduating from a Zionist academy, and then joined his father in business. At 14, he was an active member of the Bund. Under a threat of exile to Siberia, he came to America in 1911. Since that time he has been a leader in the labor movement, and is at present head of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.

Hillman is also of Russian-Jewish origin. He was born in 1887 in Kovno, son of a wool merchant. He attended a Talmudic seminary in that city, learning Jewish law and history as taught by the famed Jewish ethicists, Rabbis Eleazar and Akiba. He was associated with one of the many revolutionary movements at the age of 15. He fled Russia, fearing exile, at the age of 20. His rise in the labor movement was similar to Dubinsky's, and his present position is president of the Amalgamated Clothings Worker's Union. The Dubinsky-Hillman-Rose-Waldman control of the American Labor Party represents a usurpation of power. The party was originally founded by Major Berry and C.I.O. leader John L. Lewis. Its purpose at the time of its founding was to aid in re-electing Governor Herbert Lehman of New York, and President Roosevelt.

In 1936, its leaders conducted a vicious campaign against Alf Landon, condemning him as semi-Fascist and anti-Semitic. "If you vote for Roosevelt," its leaders told the people, "at least no one will drink Jewish blood."

In 1936 the American Labor Party polled 275,000 votes. In 1937, when it supported Mayor La Guardia for re-election, this figure jumped to 482,-459, nearly doubling in a year. At this rate, the party expects to command almost a million votes in the 1940 presidential elections.

In payment for their support of the President, both Dubinsky and Hillman were selected as presidential electors on the Democratic slate in 1936. Mr. Roosevelt, as in the case of Supreme Court Justice Black, again failed to look into the antecedents of those whom he favored.

Dubinsky has recently made a great show of being violently anti-Communist. This is due to his Trotzkyite leanings. However, he mulcted over $80,000 from the members of his garment union to turn over to the Red Spanish government. More recently he ordered an assessment on every worker to fatten the Refugee Fund, which is being used not only for Jewish refugees, but also for the parasitic Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Reds Infect U. S. Air Force

NEW YORK—Hundreds of American Communist aviators—all sworn to sabotage the American army in case of a war against Russia—have lately been received into the Civilian Air Corps of the National Youth Administration.

The new fliers are graduates of the International Workers' Order Flying School, located at Floyd Bennett Field, and have been trained by Red veterans of the Communist-Loyalist army in Spain and the Communist-Nationalist army in China.

In time of war, the Red aviators will become officers in the regular American air corps. When and if the Communist revolution breaks out in America, these men will be expected to co-operate with Red cells in the Army and Navy.

Though it openly boasts of maintaining one of the largest flying schools in the United States, the International Workers' Order, which tries to pass as a fraternal organization, keeps silent about its affiliations with the Communist party.

William Weiner, president of the I. W.O., is a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party and is the third-ranking Red in the United States. He has charge of the party's finances and it is he who finds the funds to support the various Communist Front organizations.

Mr. Weiner is also the head of Jewish People's Committee against Fascism and Anti-Semitism, the spearhead of the Communist attack against Father Coughlin and the Catholic Church.

War Decalogue of the Anti-Christ

The following Ten Rules of the Russian Godless Society are being circulated in leaflet form among the Red army:

(1) There is no God who can protect you from enemy bullets.

(2) Your death may liberate hundreds of millions of people from religious slavery.

(3) Every church, synagogue or temple may be the nest of your enemy.

(4) Have no pity with the enemies of atheism.

(5) See to it that your comrade does not avail himself of a priest when dying.

(6) Religious buildings must be kept intact as monuments of former times.

(7) Remain an atheist in war time and try to gain your enemy for the godless movement.

(8) After the war the whole world will be godless.

(9) The Soviet Union will ever be the protector of the international atheistic movement.

(10) Atheism will remain victor in this war.

Press and Propaganda

The Animalist Crusade

Success of 'Masterpiece' Emphasizes Septic Condition of Publishing Racket

By Brother Dexter

("Tommy Gallagher's Crusade," by James Farrell, Vanguard Press, New York.)

Of the four-footed things that go about in the strange forest of American literature rooting for truffles, James Farrell is possibly the most expert. He belongs to the same hairy, rubber-nosed species as Hemingway and Hecht and his style is, if anything, more brutal.

Mr. Farrell first brought his grunting to the attention of critics with *"Studs Lonigan,"* the chronicle of an Irish boy from Chicago's South Side who failed to see and follow the red beacon of Communism and *ergo* and *ipso facto* went to pieces. Mr. Farrell's grunting and squealing then went on to Case History No. 2, a Chicago lad by the name of Stanley O'Neill, who did see and follow the red light and did not go to pieces. (*"No Star is Lost," "A World I Never Made."*) With the technique characteristic of his species and genus, Mr. Farrell modestly allows that the important young men he describes are really himself—the first, Mr. Farrell lost; the second, Mr. Farrell won through the animalistic evangel of Karl Marx.

All Semblance of Art Overthrown

With the publication last week, however, of *"Tommy Gallagher's Crusade,"* Mr. Farrell takes a new tack. This work is not a novel, nor a series of stories, nor, indeed, fiction. It amounts very simply to a *tour-de-force* in Communist propaganda—a cheap, utterly unbased and unjustified and brazen vilification of Father Coughlin, the Catholic Church, Christian Americanism. The only thing that makes it look like a book is its price—and a dollar is rather high for a throwaway to be tossed to anti-Coughlinites and animalists in general.

SOCIAL JUSTICE would not waste space reviewing this fabrication were it not that the moment is opportune to turn the spotlight of clear thinking upon the present state of American letters. The critics almost to a man hailed *"Tommy Gallagher's Crusade"* as a "new Farrell masterpiece" — whence the book may be used as a thermometer. When a man can put his feet under a typewriter table, grind out 50,000 words of vituperation against a prominent friend of the American people and then have it sold to these people as a "masterpiece" of literature, it takes no specialist to diagnose the presence of septic poisoning in the literary body.

The Jewish publishers ballyhooed *"Tommy Gallagher's Crusade"* as *"a few days in the life of a follower of an anti-Semitic radio priest."* There is only one radio priest, and the fact that Father Coughlin has repeatedly called upon the good Jews of this country to join the Christians in their fight against the septic Jews and other animalists, is of course ignored. The publicity naturally also ignores the fact that Mr. Farrell knows nothing about Father Coughlin and has never met him; and must know, if he knows anything, that the radio priest does not sanction subversive militant movements of the type described in *"Tommy Gallagher's Crusade."*

Familiar Inventions With Renovated Paint

Young Tommy Gallagher sells a magazine called *Christian Justice*, whose pages—along with the Sunday radio talks of a "Father Moylan"—convert him to anti-Semitism. The hero and his "Fascist" pals spend most of their evenings smashing Communist meetings, beating up Jews and generally acting like hoodlums in the streets of New York.

Being a follower of Father Moylan, it goes without saying that Tommy is a no-good. He can't hold a job; he can't get along with his family; he has no real ideology—his backbone is so spongy that he even lets the flesh betray him with a pretty young animalist in the enemy camp. So much for Gallagher.

As to Father Moylan, Mr. Farrell has called even less upon his creativeness: he has merely transcribed from the Communist *Daily Worker*, the stale, mephitic inventions which the Red magicians produce to discredit Father Coughlin. Anti-Semitism; connivance with Big Business; hatred of labor unions; attacks on the poor by gangsters; all the standard vilifications of the Devil's cathechism are duly copied. That all these propositions have no more kinship to the truth than a green moray has to a pelican, bothers Mr. Farrell, the literary artist, not a whit more than it would Mr. Browder, the passport-forger.

But an Author Must Have Truffles

Nevertheless, why blame Mr. Farrell? He is, after all, merely a victim of circumstance, like poor, Christian-minded Studs Lonigan. What would happen to Mr. Farrell if he wrote a novel defending Father Coughlin, or even expressing an intelligent interest in the priest's Christian program? Why, he would be ostracized at literary teas; his pals would inch away from him in the Times Square bars; intimates would warn, then drop him; publishers' doors would be slammed in his face; he would be encircled, blockaded, starved into giving up the bright belled cap of authorship. Authors must eat; and Mr. Farrell wants not only to be an author, but a popular one—the kind who can order truffles at Sardi's.

It has happened before. Until last summer, Douglas Reed, brilliant British political commentator and biographer, was lionized on both sides of the Atlantic. Then, in *"Disgrace Abounding"* he indicated that the Jews can never be assimilated but must remain a distinct social problem. For this daring assumption, based on years of observation and research, Mr. Reed's work was turned down by all American publishers. Because he *"made too pointed remarks about Hebrews,"* as one national magazine euphemistically put it, he is no longer a Literary Light.

The same with Louis Ferdinand Celine, French genius who wrote *"Death on the Instalment Plan"* and other international best sellers. He had the effrontery to plead (in *"Bagatelles pour un Massacre"*) for world-wide vaccination against the poison spread by septic Jews. Not only has no English translation been made, but the French text of Mr. Celine's book got no further in this country than Ellis Island.

Again, there is Jerome Weidman, whose novels, *"I Can Get It For You Wholesale"* and *"What's in It For Me?"* were withdrawn from circulation last Spring after the publishers, Simon and Schuster, had been besieged with protests that Weidman libeled the Jewish race.

Further examples are unnecessary. Anybody who makes his living by the pen has, at one time or another, been blocked or tricked by the animalistic opportunism of American publisherdom. Which is not sayng that Jews control all publishing. It would be more honestly diagnostic to say that publishing is infected by a virus—*semisemitic septicemia.*

'Those Gullible Americans'

From a Staff Correspondent

I. A Confession

NEW YORK, N. Y.—A confession that has an intimate bearing on propaganda as practiced in the present conflict was published in the London *Jewish Chronicle* of Feb. 7, 1936. It was signed by one, S. Landman, a British propaganda agent. The following quotation from the 1,200-word article written by a Jew and published in a Jewish paper can hardly be ignored:

"During the critical days of the war in 1916, when the decision of Russia was imminent and Jewish opinion generally was anti-Russian and had hopes that Germany, if victorious, would give them Palestine, several attempts were made by the Allies to bring America into the war on their side. These attempts were unsuccessful.

"Mr. James Malcolm, at that time in close touch, took the initiative in convincing representatives of the British and French governments that the best and perhaps the only way to induce the American President to come into the war was to secure the co-operation of Zionist Jewry by promising them Palestine.

"Sir Mark Sykes obtained permission from the War Cabinet to authorize Mr. Malcolm to approach the Zionists on that basis. Neither Sir Mark Sykes nor Mr. Malcolm knew the Zionist leaders, and M. L. J. Greenberg arranged for Mr. Malcolm to meet Dr. Chaim Weizmann and Nahum Sokolow.

"The Zionists carried out their pact and helped bring America into the war. The Balfour Declaration was not merely a voluntary gesture on part of the Allies, but it was a contract between the British government and the Jewish people."

II. A Program

And in the 1939 edition of *"Propaganda in the Next War,"* Sidney Rogerson, also a British expert in fact camouflage, writes:

"Our minor propaganda will aim at attaching the support of important sections, such as the Jews, probably by the declaration of a clear-cut policy on Palestine and of our intention, if victorious, to put an end to anti-Semitic persecution; and of the Roman Catholic community in similar terms. These should not be difficult to pursue, nor to put over to the American public. We shall as before send over our leading literary lights and other men with names well known in the United States to put our point of view over the dinner tables.

"For one thing, the American is the great champion of the oppressed —and frequently of the *soi-disant* oppressed—which may explain why he is so frequently taken in by the 'hard luck' story of London confidence tricksters! Secondly, the American peoples are still under the influence of much of the Great War propaganda. They are more susceptible than most peoples to mass suggestion—they have been brought up on it and since 1918 they have shut themselves off from reality."

Short Wave Broadcasts from Abroad

In addition to daily news broadcasting and the newspaper reader's favorite indoor sport of separating propaganda from fact, there is available to the public for this war the short-wave broadcasts in the various foreign countries.

The Service Bureau of the Radio Manufacturers Association, Washington, D. C., has listed short-wave radio broadcasts from Europe. They explain that the only reception in the morning hours is on the 13 and 16-meter band and are weak signals.

For best reception listen:
Early afternoon—19 meters
Late afternoon—19 and 25 meters
Evenings and nights—25 and 31 meters.

IN ENGLISH

Berlin	6:00 P.M.—25.4 and 19.7 M
Moscow	7:00 P.M.—19 M
London	7:30 P.M.—25.5 M
Rome	7:30 P.M.—19.6 — 25.4 — 31.1 M
Berlin	8:15 P.M.—25.4—19.7 M
Eindhoven (Netherlands)	8:25 P.M.—31.2 M
Madrid	8:25 P.M.—30.41 M
Paris	10:00 P.M.—25.2—25.6 M
Berlin	10:30 P.M.—25.4—19.7 M
London	11:00 P.M.—25.5—31.5 M

IN GERMAN

Berlin	5:45 P.M.—25.4—19.7 M
Berlin	8:00 P.M.—25.4—19.7 M
Berlin	10:15 P.M.—25.4—19.7 M
Paris	10:40 P.M.—25.2—25.6 M
Rome (In Italian)	8:50 P.M.—19.6—25.4—31.1 M
Paris (In French)	9:15 P.M.—25.2—25.6 M

Eight Hours of Inaction!

THE WEEK'S prize for understatement must go again to the *American Hebrew* magazine for its report of the Jewish General Council meeting. The editorial, which followed the magazine's tribute acknowledging the "special debt which the Jews owe to the late Cardinal Mundelein," reads as follows:

"The Jewish General Council met last Sunday to consider plans for augmenting its efforts in Jewish defense and relief work and to act upon other matters of general interest to the Jewish community. Four of the largest Jewish organizations are included in the Council: the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith and the Jewish Labor Committee. The meeting lasted over eight hours.

"As a result of this coming together, ***nothing of value occurred. No action was taken. No official statement was issued.*** The date for the next meeting was not set.

"And some people *have the nerve to speak of an international Jewish conspiracy!*"

Through the Years

LONDON (1914)—The rapacious Hun invaders of Belgium have distinguished themselves by cutting off the hands of defenseless babies. When not engaged in this amusing pastime, ferocious German soldiers impale young women on their bloody bayonets.

LONDON (1939)—The captain of the 6,903-ton *Louisiana* reported that the submarine which attacked his ship, deliberately shelled the vessel's lifeboats while they were being loaded hastily, killing the first mate and wounding six crew members.

Labor and Agriculture

Fuehrer J. L. Lewis Says: 'War Goes On'

C.I.O. Boss Persists in Putting Personal Ambitions Above Labor's Interests

THE NEWS: Repeating his recent peace plan to the American Federation of Labor, President Roosevelt appealed to C.I.O. leaders in convention at San Francisco to mend their four-year quarrel with the A.F.L. and give American working men a unified labor movement.

Remarks by C.I.O. President John L. Lewis and several of his chief lieutenants prior to the reception of the President's message indicated clearly that the possibilities of labor peace were remote

COMMENT: Mr. Roosevelt stressed the fact that "national unity depends upon mutual confidence, good will and co-operation." None of these exist in the relationship between the A.F.L. and the C.I.O. Although the Federation at its Cincinnati convention left the door open to peace negotiations, Lewis and his comrades slammed it shut, locked it and to all appearances threw away the key.

Portending continuation of the bitter labor warfare by which Lewis hopes to break the A.F.L. and enthrone himself as America's labor czar were Lewis' own challenging words.

Behold the Conqueror!

"Five years ago my voice was a feeble voice in this hall," he said. "But today I come back to San Francisco and behind me is an army of 4-million men and women, a greater numerical force than ever followed any conqueror in the pages of history. When I come back five years from now, and come back I will, I will come into San Francisco with at least 10-million dues-paying members."

In that statement lies the answer to the question of whether American working men and American employers shall continue to be subjected to endless union squabbles, with their consequent unwarranted strikes, violence and general ill-feeling.

Unless Mr. Lewis is blessed with a change of heart, the war will go on. Thousands of men will be pulled out on needless strikes and their wives and children will be deprived of food and clothing as the workers endure payless paydays for the sake of John L. Lewis' personal power. And the clique of Red leaders whom Lewis has permitted to operate within his ranks will continue to spread the gospel of class warfare sponsored by the various brands of Communism, which they espouse.

Quibbling About Bickering

As Lewis defied the Federation, three of his top-ranking aids also slapped down any hopes for renewal of peace negotiations. John Brophy, C.I.O. national director, declared there could be no peace on the A.F.L.'s terms "because they involve destruction of the C.I.O." He said, "We cannot revert to the system of internal bickering in the A.F.L. which kept the American labor movement helpless and ineffective for so long."

We believe the record of the American labor movement demonstrates that labor was making sizable gains before the C.I.O. was conceived. And as for "internal bickering in the A.F.L." it is infinitesimal compared to the strife originated by John L. Lewis and intensified by his Red cohorts.

JOHN L. LEWIS

All Out of Step But Mr. Lewis

THE NEWS: In his presidential report to the second national convention of the C.I.O., John L. Lewis castigated the National Labor Relations Board, employers, the American Federation of Labor, "Tory Republicans" and "renegade Democrats."

Once a staunch defender of the Wagner Act and its administration by the Labor Board, Lewis charged the board "may completely destroy existing advantages which labor now enjoys under the act."

COMMENT: It seems everybody is out of step but John L. Lewis. Not so long ago he was one of the New Deal's articulate champions. Now, although the Administration's policies have not changed, Lewis declares it is "perfectly obvious that the past year has seen a substantial halt in any steps toward a progressive economic program."

We agree heartily with his criticism, but cannot help remember that Mr. Lewis never ventured such an opinion before, despite the fact that the Administration's economic program has been terrible for some time.

During the last regular session of Congress, when the A.F.L. sought to have the Wagner Act modified, Lewis denounced the proposal with vehemence, declaring that both the Act and the Labor Board's administration of it were eminently fair. Since then a few Board decisions unfavorable to the C.I.O. have been rendered; so the Act and the Board now are the objects of Lewis' dictatorial wrath.

When the A.F.L. and employers throughout the nation were protesting the Board's bias in favor of the C.I.O.; when the C.I.O. was winning practically every important case heard by the Board, Lewis howled at any suggestion of a change. But listen to him now:

"When the Act is so administered as to thwart the development and maintenance of stable industrial relations, then it becomes necessary to consider and weigh carefully whether the benefits of the Act outweigh the dangers which its administration inflicts upon organized labor."

It all depends upon who's toes are stepped on, according to Mr. Lewis. Having denounced the Labor Board, "Tory Republicans," renegade Democrats, "anti-union" employers, the A.F.L. and the New Deal, Mr. Lewis seems to have only one true group of friends—the Reds. They are the only people with whom he has not taken issue.

One for Justice: Sentner Put Away

THE NEWS: A jury at Montezuma, Iowa, has found William Sentner, Communist C.I.O. leader, guilty of criminal syndicalism in connection with the riots at Newton, Iowa, during a sit-down strike at the Maytag Washing Machine Company in 1938.

The court heard testimony that Sentner had admitted he was a member of the Missouri state committee of the Communist Party.

COMMENT: Sentner's fate should be the fate of every Red labor agitator in the country. There is no valid excuse for jeopardizing the freedom and unity of the United States by tolerating those who seek to disrupt the nation and inflict their godless, Marxian doctrines on this country.

Typical of Communist duplicity, Sentner, through his attorney, sought to bar the testimony linking him with the Soviets. The plea was that this information was a "military secret," because it was obtained at a previous military inquiry into the strike disorders.

But the court wisely overruled the sly, Red strategy and Sentner's own testimony at the military inquiry was introduced—testimony in which he confessed his Moscow affiliations.

As a result Mr. Sentner faces a long prison term and a stiff fine. We only regret he will have none of his riot-inciting, Communist C.I.O. colleagues to keep him company during his internment

CORDELL HULL

An Indictment That Warns Labor

THE NEWS: The Department of Justice drive against alleged violations of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act by unions in the building industry has begun with the indictment of an A.F.L. union at Washington, D. C.

The indictment charged Local 639 of the Drivers, Chauffeurs, and Helpers Union, an affiliate of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen and Helpers, with employing strikes, boycotts and intimidation and delaying construction of Government buildings. The alleged acts were unlawful and in restraint of trade, according to the charge.

COMMENT: Without assuming that the union and its officials are guilty of the charges against them, it is pertinent to state that there is entirely too much inter-union warfare in the labor movement. Inter-union warfare is blamed for the conditions recited in the Washington indictment. Local 639, it is alleged, sought to force contractors to hire their members in place of unionists of Local 77 of the International Union of Operating Engineers, also A.F.L.

The defendants in this case may be innocent. We do not know. But we do know that similar union squabbles have occurred in many cities, much to the distress of workmen and contractors alike.

Organized labor can never hope to achieve its proper goal until its leaders pack away their petty differences and work for unity in the interests of their dues-paying members. This certainly should not be especially difficult when the antagonists belong to one family—the American Federation of Labor. A.F.L. leaders, beset on one side by the Red-ridden C.I.O., should realize that by bickering amongst themselves they are only paving the way for the C.I.O. steamroller and its Communist riders.

WANTED: 10,000 SALESMEN

More distributors for SOCIAL JUSTICE magazine are needed in every area.

Profit to you is greater than with any other publication.

Write Circulation Department, Social Justice Publishing Company, Royal Oak, Michigan.

How Mr. Hull Stabs the Farmers

THE NEWS: At the request of the Progressive Farmers of Iowa, the Raw Materials National Council, a research organization soon will seek a court ruling on validity of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

The farm group charged in a resolution adopted at a conference in Sioux City, Iowa, that the Act is unconstitutional and has operated to the detriment of American agriculture.

COMMENT: If anyone is in a position to determine the effect of Administration's reciprocal trade treaties upon American farmers, the farmers of Iowa certainly should be in that position.

They know whether the demand for their products has been increased or decreased, whether prices received have been higher or lower as a result of the treaties and, from experience, they know what to expect if proposed similar trade agreements with foreign countries should be concluded.

Citing records of the Department of Commerce, the farm group showed that, during the first 7 months of 1939, imports of agricultural products were double the value of exports. This ridiculously adverse trade balance, it was pointed out, developed after the reciprocal treaties, purportedly designed to aid the United States, had been operative 5 years. Meanwhile, millions of poverty-ridden American farmers were being forced deeper into debt because of the lack of "demand" for their products; and meanwhile the New Deal was subsidizing and regimenting those farmers at the expense of every taxpayer in the country, and at the expense of the farmers' liberty.

While the Administration theorists in Washington watched American farmers suffer from low prices and loss of markets, Secretary of State Hull was concluding and planning treaties which would further decrease prices and create further loss of markets. And while the New Dealers bemoaned the existence of huge alleged agricultural surpluses, they lowered tariffs, thereby facilitating importation of the very products they declared were glutting the domestic market.

Fully aware that this commonsense argument has no place in a court controversy over the constitutionality of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the Raw Materials National Council is expected to base its case on the allegation that the Secretary of State validly should not be empowered to write tariff laws without consent of Congress.

Should the Act be upheld, American farmers apparently have only one recourse—praying for the advent of a Secretary of State who will devise treaties favorable to American, rather than foreign, agriculture.

Economics

Phony Reichsmarks

Western Money Masters' Clever Financial Tricks Boomerang on Them

THE INTERNATIONAL money masters who have stripped many of the nations of their gold reserve and reduced them to a system of barter have been confronted by many clever artifices and devices invented and used by these nations in their financial desperation and commercial isolation. These artifices are rather ironical, because they are modifications and adaptations of the money masters' own tricks.

Much to the surprise of the Sassoons, who cornered the silver of the Orient, Japan has waged its war with China through the issuance of scrip, relying only upon cash for foreign loans.

The Governors of the Bank of France were surprised to find that the bank had acquired a fortune in Reichsbank notes which the Reichsbank declared counterfeits. The two hundred families of French finance were astounded to discover that the Reichsbank had counterfeited its own notes and used them in foreign trade to obtain foreign currency.

The Bank of France received a circular from the Ministry of Finance reading: "I have the honor to place at your disposal for all proper purposes the information that Germans are supposed to be passing German banknotes at a special price. These banknotes are supposed to have three indelible marks on each side, thanks to which they are being refused by the German banks, since these signs show they have been fraudulently brought back into Germany. From the information at hand, it would seem that a great number of these banknotes are actually being sold on the British market by the Reichsbank in order to obtain foreign exchange. (Signed) Jacques Ruefe, Director of the Treasury."

Why Dr. Schacht Was Forced Out

Then banking circles learned the reason for the Reichsbank refusal to honor certain German banknotes which some foreign banks had accumulated in quantities. Although these notes were genuine, the Reichsbank refused to honor them. Experts assumed in the beginning that the banknotes were clever counterfeits, but when the Ministry of Finance addressed this letter to the President of the French Bankers' Association the money men knew that the notes were genuine and had been issued by the Reichsbank.

Bankers were amazed at the affrontery of the Reichsbank which sold the notes for foreign currency and then proceeded to void them. Since that time, orthodox bankers have suspected that Dr. Schacht refused to co-operate in the plot and that this is the reason he was replaced by Dr. Walter Funk, the faithful Nazi. German bankers knew that the plot would be discovered, but they figured they were justified in adopting such war-like methods in the banking field with prospective enemies who had encircled them politically, isolated them economically and bankrupted them financially.

Profit as High as 75 Per Cent

Wall Street learned with a shock that business men in the Reich were co-operating with the Reichsbank in its plot to mulct foreign purchasers. When American traders and buyers desired to purchase a bill of goods at deflated prices in Germany they made their bids to the manufacturer or sales corporation in Germany. If the bid covers costs, and there is no profit, the German business men take up the matter with the Reichsbank. The bankers grant permission to put the deal through. When the American trader makes the settlement with American money, half the proceeds are put into the purchase of foreign exchange with a view for future profits.

The other half the Reichsbank uses to buy German national obligations at discount prices in foreign currency and bond markets. In some instances where the German obligations are discounted at 25c on the dollar there is a profit of approximately 75% if the Reichsbank redeems these obligations at par. Half the profit in the transaction goes to the Reichsbank and the other half to the German business men.

Those Clever Russians Showed the Way

The Reich has taken a few pages from Soviet Russia's book of financial intrigue—tricks taught Communist creatures by their money baron creators. Soviet Russia created a scrip ruble for domestic use and counterfeited credit certificates for its commercial agencies. All traders know that Soviet obligations are no good, unless they are guaranteed by the signature of the Bank of Moscow and many traders learned this only when they found themselves holding the bagful of worthless Russian commercial notes.

For some years the Soviet government has been purchasing Russian national obligations at discount rates of a fraction of a cent on the dollar through agencies in Wall Street and discharging these obligations within Russia at full rates. In these transactions the Russian government has made a profit of 100% to 1000%. The Reich is pulling the same tricks but not, as did Russia, with the approbation of the world's money masters.

The Profits of the King

LONDON—Latest reports from the British capital indicate that Vickers, Ltd., one of the four largest munition companies in the world, is doing the biggest business in its history.

Vickers' increasing financial gains make interesting reading for the English gentry who control the company and whose interests in the present war are not exclusively ideological. Last year the cannon factories of Vickers showed a net profit of more than $5-million.

During the last war King George V was an equity owner of Vickers, and it is permissible to suppose that his holdings have passed to his son, George VI. Other stockholders during the 1914-18 bloodfest were four Anglican bishops and the gloomy Dean Inge of St. Paul's, who is now once again urging British Tommies to give their all on Flanders Fields.

In 1933, Premier Chamberlain owned 11,747 shares of Imperial Chemical Industries, which has close financial connections with Vickers.

Our Neighbors

A Reporter In Canada

TORONTO, ONTARIO—*"Allies at War with Germany!"*

That rude news, screeched from the hoarse throats of paper-vending street urchins, shattered the Sunday morning stillness on September 3, 1939, and all those living in this North American British Dominion knew that only a matter of days separated their own nation from a deathlock struggle with Hitler's Germany.

For, in war time as well as peace time, Canada's allegiance is to her king. And dutifully, if somewhat reluctantly, Canada's governing officials gathered into parliamentary session to make the declaration that would turn a happy, prosperous, youthful nation into an industrial robot to manufacture engines of death and destruction.

Thus war's grim realism is brought to America and scattered through this province, rich in industrial progress and inland commerce; through the Northwest, with its vast grain fields, and through the picturesque Northeast, where humble folk till the soil and live close to their God.

Everywhere There Are Soldiers

War's tragedy already is written into the faces of the staunch Canadians, as "preparedness" is the watchword, and as the nation is tuned for war. In small town after small town soldiers throng the streets, gather in knots before guard headquarters and before recruiting stations. Signs reading "Help Defeat Dictatorship" are spotted throughout the cities, and the tension of uncertainty has replaced the calm of every-day life.

At the Exposition grounds in this city, on an ordinary day, hundreds of young soldiers paraded in drill formation. Others gathered in groups listening to patriotic speeches. Still others, newly recruited, straggled surprisedly in awkward, uneven groups, attired in ill-fitting uniforms taken only recently from storage boxes. Here and there a colorful uniform stood out, particularly the Highlanders in their kilts, and officers in smartly-tailored military clothes.

In Toronto's beautiful Queen's Park groups of soldiers responded to the commands of their officers before the eyes of spectators who jammed the available space. Automobiles lined the streets blocked off for the military display.

Two Pounds of Sugar Per Person

War, with its economic as well as its military phases, came to Canada with a jolt. Food prices hiked amazingly and panic-buying sent stocks to the diminishing point the day before England declared war.

Town after town on that Saturday night found itself sold out of sugar and flour and, on Monday morning, when stocks were replenished, restrictions were put into effect immediately: two pounds of sugar to a person, with future quantities subject to change.

Tea, coffee, foodstuffs, raw materials—all followed the rocketing price trend. Coffee jumped 13 cents in one week. Unpackaged tea raced forward 10 cents a pound and more, and hysterical shoppers depleted the stores. A possible scarcity of wool and leather clamped rigid restrictions on wholesale houses, forced to limit their sales to retailers.

No One Trusts a Stranger

War's grisly skeleton inflicts its presence in every avenue of life, social, political, economic. An athletic organization having 150 members one year ago now has not a single member. All public buildings are closed except to holders of passes. Important factories and utility companies are open to pass-holding employes only, and armed guards stride before public buildings, industrial plants, bridges, railway structures and commercial docks. Even department stores admit their employes by pass only. No one trusts a stranger, for spies may be anywhere and everywhere, and sabotage is anticipated constantly.

The city reservoir is surrounded by barbed wire. Guards patrol its limits day and night, forming an incongruous picture, for the reservoir is underground and its top is covered with beautiful gardens, playgrounds and tennis courts.

To the citizens, the reality of war has brought a sequence of mingled feelings. There is even an appalling comfort in it for some, for those who shuddered through the uncertain days, and then settled into a feeling of depressed satisfaction. As one newspaper acquaintance put it, "At least the war of nerves is over. To live on edge from day to day was too destructive individually, and it surely was as destructive inwardly to nations."

Propaganda Did Its Work

The propaganda of the British leaders has had its effect. Many feel with deep sincerity that this is an unselfish war to destroy "Hitlerism," that this is a holy struggle to drown dictatorship in blood and elevate the white banners of democracy over all. Many believe, as they did in the last war, that this is to be the last war—a bitter, interminable war to achieve lasting peace.

And Canada's youth, too young to know the horror of the last awful struggle, still fail to respond to the flag-waving and martial music as did their fathers before them. But they go to war with a deadly seriousness, a seriousness born of the knowledge that something is wrong with a world that suffers recurring depressions, labor strikes, and conflicting political beliefs. They are not sure that war is the cure, but they are determined to see it through anyway.

St. Louis Post Dispatch

CONSCRIPT WITHOUT GLAMOUR

Preview

"Canada today is a good preview of what may happen to a great American, Anglo-Saxon democracy when it goes to war. Its democracy is abandoned. It has barely sampled war, but Magna Carta is already in the ash can and the Bill of Rights is out the window. Freedom of speech, press and radio is gone. Canadians aren't going to bother with elections—so representative government is gone. Manufacture and selling are being put under a license system. Taxes are automatically zooming—so property rights and liberty of contract are going. The government is getting ready to regulate practically all economic relations by dictatorial decree. The appalling total of all this seems to make Hitler a piker and Mussolini a maundering monk."

—Gen. Hugh S. Johnson

The Voice of Congress

Either from the *Congressional Record*, or communications directly to SOCIAL JUSTICE, these expressions of your Congressmen and United States Senators are given such deservedly wider distribution which publication in our columns will admit.

—EDITOR

Legislation by Trickery!

By HON. KARL MUNDT
Representative from South Dakota

INASMUCH AS THE House passed a neutrality bill last session retaining the arms embargo in it and since the Senate at that time refused to act on it, the strategists of the repeal drive have resorted to a sly legislative trick in an effort to deprive House members from having due opportunity to consider any legislation now passed by the Senate.

Instead of introducing a new neutrality bill in the Senate which would have been the fair and straight-forward thing to do, the star chamber session of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee (open to repealists only!) *determined upon the device of amending everything after the title of the previously passed House bill.* Thus, while the bill is an entirely new piece of legislation, it will come back to us as an amendment to the House bill and under customary procedure will go to conference, the differences ratified, and then come to us for a "yes" or "no" vote with debate limited drastically and no opportunity for amendments.

Against this totalitarian effort to apply the gag rule to the House of Representatives I protest with all my might and insist that the majority floor leader of this House assure us now that House precedents will be set aside and this body be given the rights of amendment and free debate for a minimum of 30 legislative days. At best, this would still provide less than 20 minutes per member to express his views and reflect the sentiment of his constituents upon this epochal measure. To give the House less authority than that would be a travesty on representative government, and to nullify the effectiveness of bicameral parliamentary procedure.

This smacks to me of an added indication of the growing tendency of the Administration to use war-time psychology to deprive a peace-time nation of its rights of self-government.

We saw evidences of it when an Administration spokesman recently urged Congressmen to doubt the importance of embargo mail from their constituents on the basis that it was inspired and paid for by foreign groups and fighting nations. I thought this then marked the all-time high of political arrogance when Administration spokesmen urge the people's representatives to ignore an expression of the people's will. But the chain of evidence grows longer; we now contemplate the situation where the people's representatives themselves in their own legislative chamber will be denied the rights of free debate and effective amendatory legislation.

There are even sly rumors hereabout that an effort will be made to avoid a roll call vote in the House! Yesterday's news brought the report that the National Association of Broadcasters, acting under the Administration lash, outlawed discussion of controversial issues on paid radio time as a thinly disguised move to "get Father Coughlin" while presumably war-mongering newscasters and commentators will continue their work of broadcasting horror stories and provocative rumors over the air.

It is time America spoke out against war-time censorship unless we intend to become a war-time nation. *Both those who agree and those who disagree with Father Coughlin have a right to hear his comments and both those who agree and disagree with the drive to scrap the existing neutrality laws by repealing the arms embargo have a right to be heard on the floor of the House.*

If this Congress, through hasty action, erroneously conceived or carelessly arrived at, injects America into the European war it will then be too late to demand our rights to speak and hear conflicting opinions!

Progress a Myth in Soviet Exhibit

By HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
Representative from Ohio

THERE ARE STRANGE contradictions in the spectacle of the Soviet exhibit at the world's fair. To make men free, Russia has mimicked the mechanical wonders of the Occidental world. She has copied our machines, duplicated our inventions. And, having done today what we learned to do long ago, she claims to be great. Yet our greatest achievement, the freeing of men's minds, she steadfastly refuses to follow. She is still in the days of the czars, and her exhibit at the world's fair is a snare and an illusion to those who dream of mankind in terms of human progress.

War's Cost Dwarfs Profit

By HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
Representative from Indiana

WHY SHOULD WE make ourselves an ally to the British as the Bloom bill would do? The British tried to stamp the liberty and independence out of us when we were an infant people. They tried again to destroy us and burned our Capitol in 1814. They tried to break up the Union in 1863 to 1865. They imposed upon us in the World War era by borrowing almost $5-billion and then welching on their debt, refusing even to make a token payment.

Sooner or later such legislation as is here proposed would be almost certain to draw us into war. Human nature is selfish, and war profits are alluring, and if Americans are permitted by this so-called neutrality bill to build up a gigantic and highly lucrative war trade with Britain and her allies, there is sooner or later going to be a high-pressured demand on Congress to go to whatever lengths may be necessary to protect that trade and to continue those swollen profits, even to the extent of forcing a declaration of war. If the people of America only knew the dangers that lurk behind this bill and how it threatens our peace and security, it would not get to first base on the way to enactment.

Aside from the great danger that this bill would lead us into war on account of war profits, we have to consider another question that ought to penetrate our very souls and cause each one of us to search his heart to determine whether he is living up to his responsibility to his Maker. That is the question, whether we, a professedly Christian people, are willing that America shall become an arsenal to furnish belligerent nations with the implements for mass murder. Think how proud we will feel if the dispatches from abroad should bring to us the horrible details of the agonized strangulation of innocent boys in uniforms with an effective poison gas, accompanied by the explanation, *"This gas was manufactured in Pittsburgh."*

Or how elated we will be if the news columns describing air raids tell of the blowing to bits of women and babies by bombing planes, with the explanatory note, *"The bombers with which this effective act of war was consummated were made in Seattle."*

If we are going to furnish war-mad nations with the implements for killing and torturing human beings by wholesale, we had better burn our Bibles and our churches and confess that we have no love left in our hearts for the living God!

To save ourselves from the peril of being drawn into foreign wars and to do our duty as a Christian nation we ought to ban exports entirely to belligerents instead of making America the great arsenal and storehouse of supplies for fighting nations. I commend to your thoughtful consideration the following excerpt from Secretary of State Hull's statement on neutrality, issued May 27, 1939:

"If we go in for embargoes on exports for the purpose of keeping ourselves out of war, the logical thing to do would be to make our embargo all-inclusive. Modern warfare is no longer warfare between armed forces only; it is warfare between nations in every phase of their national life. Lists of contraband are no longer limited to arms and ammunition and closely related commodities. They include not only those items which contribute toward making warfare possible, but almost every item useful in the life of the enemy nation. A nation at war is no less anxious to keep cotton or petroleum, or, indeed, any useful product, from reaching an enemy nation than it is to keep guns and airplanes from reaching the enemy's armed forces. I doubt whether we can help ourselves to keep out of war by an attempt on our part to distinguish between categories of exports."

I agree absolutely with every word of that statement by Secretary Hull, but I utterly disagree with his conclusion, which was:

"Yet a complete embargo upon all exports would be ruinous to our economic life. It therefore seems clear that we should have no general and automatic embargo inflexibly and rigidly imposed on any class or group of exports."

I am sure that Secretary Hull had not given careful consideration to the statistics of exports when he made that statement. No one expects or wishes to shut off exports to all nations. All that is contemplated is a cessation of exports to belligerent nations just as long as they remain belligerents. Yet, according to the last report of the Department of Commerce on foreign trade, the total of our exports to all foreign countries in 1937, the last year for which statistics are available, was only 7.8 per cent of our total production of movable goods. This covers our normal exports to all of the world; and if the ban on exports were applied only to two or even three or four belligerents, the loss in our normal foreign trade would be infinitesimal compared with the home market for our goods. I submit that the loss of this small fraction of our foreign business not only would not be ruinous to our economic life but it would be a small concession, indeed, compared with the frightful burden of debt that will be saddled on ourselves and on our children and our children's children if we become involved in another war. *One month of war would cost us more than our profits on foreign trade for 20 years.*

Nation in Distress Can Fight a War

By HON. USHER L. BURDICK
Representative from North Dakota

IS THIS COUNTRY ready for war of any kind?

It is well understood in military circles that for every man on the front line under arms three civilians are necessary behind the lines to keep the materials of war coming up to the front. With an army of 5-millions it would require 15-million more to bring up the fuel of war. This whole organization must be united in purpose and nothing could bring this about except public opinion.

When we have fully one-half of our population in some form of distress, with millions thrown out of their homes to become wanderers along the highways and streets, no such public opinion would or could be formed in this country. Our duty now is, if we desire to prepare for a war of defense, to adopt a policy which will enable honest men to retain their homes and care for their families. If the process of foreclosure and ejectment continues unabated as it has since 1929, the time will soon come, if it is not here now, when the great majority in this country will be homeless and a few will own the soil—the source of all life.

If the opportunity should come in the United States where the homeless could take united action, there is absolutely no doubt but what those in this country who have too much wealth would be hunted down by our own citizens and shot and their property distributed among those who were homeless. All property would be confiscated by the state, and most of the owners executed.

This Congress should concern itself with the welfare of those in distress in this country and determine the cause of that distress and forcefully correct the situation.

When we have the great majority of the people in this country enjoying the privileges of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, I will predict that there is no nation or combination of nations on earth that could send any force against us which we could not stop.

Roosevelt Elected on Foreign Policy

By HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN
Representative from Ohio

ALL OF YOU WILL doubtless recall the results of the election of 1936, and that all but two states of the Union cast their electoral votes for Franklin Delano Roosevelt to succeed himself as President of the United States of America. Exulting over the glorious victory, the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, released to the press for publication on November 7, 1936, the following unrestrained exuberance:

"Democracy never in all history functioned on a more impressive scale than when over 45-million American citizens went to the ballot boxes yesterday and recorded their views upon men and measures. No administration has ever received an endorsement so nearly universal and so nearly unanimous as that which the American people, in the free exercise of their suffrage, have given this administration.

"Not the least of our record upon which favorable judgment was pronounced were our foreign policies and foreign relations during the past 4 years. The central policy has been that if the good neighbor, the most outstanding objective of which has been the promotion of conditions of permanent peace. These high aims and purposes in time of peace and strict neutrality in time of war have been the cornerstone of American foreign policy.

"The unequivocal endorsement by the American people of these and other foreign policies is a matter of both gratification and genuine encouragement. We shall go forward with this program in the same earnest, persistent, careful, and cautious manner in which we have heretofore sought to advance this great undertaking."

We can well overlook the inaccuracies of the above statement of Mr. Hull to ask the question: Is the President willing to risk defeat of the New Deal administration for a third term by a complete reversal of foreign policy which Mr. Hull says elected him in 1936?

Americans Deceived By Own Government

By HON. GERALD P NYE
Senator from North Dakota

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE should be reminded, if they are not already amply reminded, that, without the active and constant participation of Congress in our foreign policy, they are not only likely to be uninformed concerning matters vital to them but that they, and Congress too, may again be misinformed, as they have been misinformed in the past, with tragic consequences.

In evidence of this there can be cited the admission by Secretary of State Lansing, in his letter of September 6, 1915, that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had been consciously misinformed — mind you, *consciously misinformed* — by the Department of State concerning our first change in policy, the change which permitted foreign loans to be floated in America.

Further evidence will be found in the fact, then unknown to the American people and unknown to Congress, that this same Secretary of State, as early as 1915, while he was enjoying the confidence of the people as one who was trying to keep our country out of war, desired our active military participation in Europe's war, and that he admitted later that he had failed to press our just claims against the naval powers—England and France. He said then, speaking of the protest notes dispatched to England:

"Everything was submerged in verbosity. It was done with deliberate purpose. It insured continuation of the controversies and left the questions unsettled which was necessary in order to leave this country free to act, and even to act illegally, when it entered the war."

Still further evidence is to be found in the fact that our State Department officials had realized that they had made a mistake in not warning American citizens off belligerent naval vessels and that their mistake had resulted in many American drownings. Nevertheless, the then administration, in spite of that realization, opposed Congressional resolutions which would have prevented more such drownings. The American people, no more than Congress, knew that the Solicitor for the State Department was proposing to set aside "an adequate number of ships upon which our people may take passage and travel unmolested in European waters, those ships not to carry mixed cargoes of babies and bullets." Nor did they know that other high diplomatic officials agreed with the position that the State Department had made a tragic mistake in its decision. On the contrary, when Germany proposed this same plan, we Americans were all led by our officials to believe it was arrogant and hostile.

I cite further the fact that the administration of that time realized that it had made a great mistake in the submarine controversy, the mistake of extending American protection to belligerent naval vessels—armed merchantmen—and that it tried to undo this mistake, but that England refused to allow it to do so, and that the administration kept its plans to end the submarine controversy from Congress and from the people.

On January 18, 1916, our Government secretly proposed to England and France a solution of the submarine controversy. In effect, this proposal was that all belligerent merchant vessels should cease mounting guns. This would have removed the excuse of the German submarines that they had to attack without warning, because if they ever exercised the alternative and stopped a ship by rising to the surface they would be bombarded by the armed vessel. Our Ambassador to England, Mr. Page, cabled that if our Government put this plan into effect the British would take their munitions orders away from us.

If we should insist upon our rights—in other words, if we should protect American peace and security—the British would take their munitions orders away from us. To the very end the American people were given to understand and believe that there was only one side to the submarine question in spite of the admission in private of our high officials that they had been wrong.

From the Capital

New Deal Reaping the Red Whirlwind

Revelations of Krivitsky Before Dies Committee Show Up Roosevelt Errors

THE NEWS: Spies of the Russian OGPU, operating within the United States Army and Navy, may have furnished Adolf Hitler with American military secrets, in the belief of W. G. Krivitsky, former officer of Soviet Russia's military intelligence.

This was made known to the Dies Committee sitting in Washington. Meanwhile, hope grew that the State Department would take action on this matter, so obviously dangerous to continued American peace.

COMMENT: The short-sightedness of some Administration officials and the virtual treachery of others in promoting friendly relations with Soviet Russia is revealed glaringly in the testimony of General Krivitsky.

It must be remembered that in 1933 the United States Government, under the present Roosevelt Administration, extended the hand of recognition and fellowship to the godless dictatorship established in Russia. This agreement, concluded between President Roosevelt and the former Soviet foreign affairs commissar, Maxim Litvinov, provided, among other things, that Soviet Russia would in no way attempt to propagandize Communism in the United States.

Soviet Russia Violates Pledge

Almost immediately, however, Soviet Russia attempted an almost unparalleled campaign of propaganda through its satellite, the Communist Party of America. In 1935, in Moscow, it was decided that to woo American sympathy even further the "Trojan Horse" system — under which Communist organizations mask their identity—would be adopted.

Then followed Communist penetration of American labor unions, political organizations, universities, forums and even, in some isolated instances, American religious institutions. Political leaders followed the command of the braying Communists to "embargo Hitler," and at the same time aid Russia. The godless Soviet state was bracketed as a "democracy" along with this country, Great Britain and France.

But, with the conclusion of the Soviet-Nazi trade and non-aggression pact, Administration leaders learned, shamefacedly, that Communism in Russia and Naziism in Germany were following the same path. Yet, while Communist Russia under the whip hand of Josef Stalin was peppering America with Communist spies, our attention — thanks to Hollywood — was devoted to hunting down the type of moron pictured in "Confessions of a Nazi Spy."

Soviet and Reich Pals Since 1922!

Krivitsky's testimony is damaging to future domestic contentment on the part of Communists in America. As SOCIAL JUSTICE said many months ago, and as General Krivitsky reiterated before the Dies Committee, Russian-German understanding had progressed great distances, long before it cropped out in the open in the recent, pre-war "trade and non-aggression pact." Krivitsky told the Dies Committee that German troops had been trained on Russian soil to evade provisions of the Versailles Treaty.

GENERAL KRIVITSKY

The military machines of the Soviet and the Reich, he said, have been cooperating since 1922!

During that time, traditional American tolerance gave the Communists of Russia a fertile land in which to spread their poisonous philosophy. Krivitsky said the United States is not considered a "difficult" country in which to carry on spy activity. And, while melodramatic fanfare attended the seizing of a handful of incompetent, addle-minded fools in the pay of the German Reich last year, while the "Nazi spy" scare was being blown up all out of proportion to its importance, Russian spies were doing their job quietly and contentedly, free from any interference—for Stalin and Hitler.

Why was this possible? For the same reason that makes it possible for Earl Browder, high Communist official, to go free after confessing to traveling on a false passport, while vulgar Fritz Kuhn, the windy fuehrer of the German-American Bund, is jailed on charges of stealing money from his organization.

Surely the Administration has learned its lesson. Surely it has learned that Russia is governed by crafty, atheistic criminals; surely it is time to withdraw recognition from this country, and to ban the Communist Party in America. And they can ban the Bund along with it, if that affords any consolation.

Behind the Embargo Vote

THE NEWS: Administration forces leading the battle to repeal the embargo on arms shipments to belligerents won a "test of strength" vote on a motion to recommit the contested neutrality measure. The vote was 65-26.

The motion was presented by Senator Tobey of New Hampshire who proposed to establish the "cash and carry" system for *all* American trade with belligerents—non-war goods as well as arms. Under such a recommittal the measure would have been returned to the Foreign Relations Committee, where two bills would have been written, replacing the controversial New Deal measure.

Of these bills, one would be concerned with holding or lifting the embargo; the other would set forth regulations governing all American shipping. Administration forces were quick to proclaim the vote a prophecy of defeat for the isolationists.

COMMENT: The rough treatment given Senator Tobey's motion in the Senate is indicative of at least one thing. It indicates that Senator Pittman, leader of the repeal forces, and President Roosevelt were speaking *insincerely* when they condemned the present embargo law on the ground that it made no distinction between war goods and non-war goods.

Senator Pittman, especially, had protested that the embargo law threatened American peace, because it permitted shipment of military potential—raw goods to be processed for military purposes—while prohibiting the shipment of finished armaments. Obviously, one would believe that Senator Pittman favored a law to correct this condition.

Such was not the case, however. After the vote was taken the name of Senator Pittman was found in its usual place, on the New Deal side of the ledger, with the 100 per cent "Roosevelt, right or wrong" forces. Similarly, the names of all the New Dealers and misguided Senate repealists who had protested that the present act is unneutral, for the reason given above, were found to be opposed to Senator Tobey's resolution.

In other words, all the hot, wind-filled argument over the "unneutrality" of the present embargo law, was simply an oratorical device, utterly devoid of sincerity, intended to convert isolationists to the cause of repeal by tormenting their minds with fear.

The issue has not changed. The proposed Roosevelt - Hull - Bloom - Pittman-Baruch neutrality measure advocates lining up this country with Britain and France by furnishing them munitions.

If Mr. Roosevelt's misnamed neutrality measure is not the pathway to war, then the pathway has not been defined.

'Fixing Up' Army Funds

THE NEWS: President Roosevelt has revealed that, although the law governing the enlargement of United States military and naval forces prohibits deficit spending for housing and hospitalization of the recruited men, he has authorized such expenditures anyway, confident that Congress would "fix up" the law at its first opportunity.

COMMENT: None of us would deny the President, at this time, an opportunity to build the military and naval forces to their full peace time strength. But why should the President deliberately, even brazenly, defy existing law in reaching that objective?

In the first place, the law referred to provides expenditures for wages, food, and clothing of the recruited forces, prohibits deficit spending for housing and hospitalization of these men. If the law is unworkable, why was it written?

The President said he was confident the law would be "fixed up" later. Congress is in session now, yet the President proposes having the "fixing" done, according to his own admission, sometime after next January. Instead of taking the law to Congress for amendment—and Congress surely would amend the statute if amendment were reasonable—the President took the law for a yachting trip on the Potomac, a cruise upon which his guests were Supreme Court Justices Felix Frankfurter and Harlan F. Stone. The President said he "discussed" the matter with these men.

We do not condemn Mr. Roosevelt's zeal in the defense of this country, within reasonable limits. We do condemn Mr. Roosevelt's disrespect for law, a disrespect evident at present in his bitter battle on the Neutrality Act passed in 1937.

Elementary school children understand that the function of the President of the United States is to execute and administer the law; not circumvent or ignore it in the hope that his adventures will be "fixed up" sometime in the future.

U. S. Deficit and the War

THE NEWS: The United States added nearly $1-billion to its already towering deficit in the three months ended September 30, figures released by the United States Treasury Department reveal.

The Treasury reported that $1,446,615,184 in tax revenue was collected in the first quarter of the present fiscal year (July 1 through September 30), but that expenditures for the same period were $2,422,675,486.

Increased military expenses and payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation accounted for the increased expenditures, according to the report.

COMMENT: While war in Europe has distracted the attention of Americans momentarily from the sad financial state of this country, this Treasury report serves to reassure them that rash New Deal spending goes on, and on, and on.

And as the national debt mounts daily toward the limit set by law—the point at which bankruptcy ensues—the Administration insists on flirting with the war abroad in such a fashion that involvement of this country seems a mighty real threat.

The Treasury blames the disjointed condition of excess expenditures over income, on the fact that military budgets have absorbed much of the tax fund. If that be true, what would one, two, or four years of war, in which this country is involved, do to a nation whose financial solvency already totters on the brink?

War goods, it must never be forgotten, are non-productive goods in that they are designed to destroy, rather than to build. Heavy artillery shells rip through factories, destroy dies and scientific instruments capable of producing wealth. Bombs blast forests, mines, dams and power plants, ruining these sources of heat, light and power. Incendiary shells burst near processing mills and storage bins, reducing to smoking ruins the wealth that has been created by the toil of man.

Thus the end of war invariably finds a nation driven to its knees; impoverished; its progress set back several decades.

These thoughts must be borne in mind when (1) scatter-brained economists advocate our traffic in war goods as a method of balancing our national budget; (2) insane zealots advocate our entering war to fight for a phantom "democracy" or "security" on a foreign battlefield.

Why Are the Allies So Sure of Us?

THE NEWS: Although the Neutrality Act has not been scrapped and its provisions still prohibit the shipment of arms and munitions to belligerents, it is known in Washington that the British and French governments have selected agents to direct their arms purchases in this country.

COMMENT: The wily Allies, wishing to waste no motion once Mr. Roosevelt completes his assassination of the Neutrality Act, have named the commissions to do their purchasing in the United States once the ban is lifted. And this leads to the question: "Who inspired in the Allies this cocky assurance that the Neutrality Act would be scrapped?"

It is readily admitted in official Washington that the United States is "morally allied" with Britain and France through the activities of Mr. Roosevelt in the past year.

It is a sad reflection on the respectability of American Government when foreign powers are so contemptuous of American laws as deliberately to plot their courses contrary to the provision of those laws. There must be a reason!

(We aim to make this a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally the views expressed are not always those of this magazine—EDITOR.)

Foreign War Unconstitutional?

TO THE EDITOR:

Some few years ago, Professor John W. Burgess, for many years at the head of the Department of Political Science of Columbia University, regarded by Professor Nicholas Murray Butler as "the greatest teacher of political science that this generation has seen," told me that at about the time the United States entered the World War he wrote an article in which he insisted that conscription for military service on foreign soil is *unconstitutional*.

He argued that the Federal Government may call on the states for troops to "suppress insurrections, and repel invasions." As "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people," it would appear that Professor Burgess advanced a sound argument.

What lawyers, or even the Supreme Court, will say about this is, of course, a matter of doubt. But, be that as it may, Professor Burgess was in a position to speak as one having authority. It seems to me that in these dangerous times this question as to the constitutionality of conscription ought to be raised. To raise it requires courage. I have written to both Senator Lodge and Senator Walsh urging that the embargo be not lifted, and calling attention to the opinion of Professor Burgess that the United States may not, constitutionally, draft men for service abroad.

—F.M.P.

Fall River, Mass.

Youth for Peace

TO THE EDITOR:

The youth of today, filled with patriotism likened to that of our forefathers, do not want war.

On the other hand, should any nation attempt to destroy the peace and domestic tranquility of our country, we stand ready to defend to the last drop of blood a nation where freedom rings throughout the land.

Realizing that we form the backbone of the nation, we turn to the Stars and Stripes to guide us in a course of peace and contentment. We salute our flag, knowing it will guide us smoothly away from the turmoil of incessant warfare.

—Lawrence Damilea

Malden, Mass.

The Polish View

TO THE EDITOR:

Being of Polish descent, I greatly favor the embargo repeal.

In my opinion, your criticisms of England and France seem to bolster the mad-dog regime of Germany.

You have stated that England and France were much greater aggressors than Germany, but this is absurd in view of the fact that the lands they conquered were uncivilized countries. On the other hand, Germany continuously menaces smaller nations which are already civilized.

Who so deceivingly masqueraded under the name of the Holy Knights and barbarically attacked nations, claiming that they were assisting Christianity, but in the meantime, stole territories for their own benefit? This Order of the Holy Knights, to convert Christianity, terrorized Europe with swords and flames until they were annihilated by the Poles.

Who started the World War? Who violated the Versailles Treaty? Who broke the ten-year non-aggression pact with Poland? Who founded the Anti-Comintern Pact and then double-crossed the signatories by signing a pact with Russia?

Hitlerism is Hunism.

—Edward Gronski

Pittsburgh, Pa.

Poland Betrayed

TO THE EDITOR:

What happens when Poland is about ready to collapse, caught between German and Russian military might? Polish leaders flee to safety, and from their safe perch they urge the poor, deceived Polish people to "defend Warsaw to the last man." What a mockery! If these leaders are such great Polish patriots why did they not stay in Warsaw and defend their capital?

Polish leaders have proved themselves incapable and they are to blame for what has transpired in Poland. If they had forsaken the "aid" of Britain and had given to Hitler what rightfully belonged to Germany, this war would never have evolved and Poland would never have had to suffer the humiliation of German and Russian troops setting foot on her soil.

This only emphasizes the fact that it is always the common people, not their leaders, who suffer in loss of life and liberty when wars are fought.

—Donald West

Boston, Mass.

Not a Bad Guess

TO THE EDITOR:

Perhaps this Administration in asking for the repeal of the present neutrality law, is not so anxious to assist England and France, as to be able to sell Russia the airplanes ordered from this country in a secret understanding with the President.

—Jessica Forbes

New York City

A Wishing War

TO THE EDITOR:

Another Red Coat steps off the first line of defense. This time, Mr. Babson, the well known "Little Sir Echo" tells the citizens of the United States that England and France shall be considered our first-line defense. What would the founding fathers think of that remark in view of the fact that both countries are our biggest debtors for a similar fiasco of twenty years ago?

What war are we engaged in other than the war to rid this nation of the alien-minded oracles who daily penetrate the minds of our citizens with a type of journalistic subterfuge which subconsciously leads the unthinking citizen into the belief that we are fighting a war in Europe on the side of England and France?

Those who think know that the power of suggestion put the price of sugar and other commodities up overnight. Can we become engaged in war with "wish thinking" so easy?

—J. M. Kildow

Barnesville, Ohio

All Greedy for Power

TO THE EDITOR:

The possibility of the arms embargo remaining as it now stands seems to have Dorothy Thompson all a-jitter. Her "On the Record" entitled *"The Use of the Mails"* bemoans the flood of mail with which the Americans are bombarding Washington.

The pen is mightier than the sword and if we do not want to be forced to use the sword, everyone who can wield the pen had better do so now. In Mr. Roosevelt's speech to Congress he stated: "I give you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the world of international peace. . . ." I wish to say that anyone who wishes to keep peace with his neighbor must first learn to keep peace in his own household. Mr. Roosevelt is a past master of verbiage, words which tell nothing of what is really in his mind.

I was very amused at Russia's statement that the only interest they had in Poland was the protection of the White Russians and the Ukrainians. It is more likely, since the White Russians were first killed off in Russia in the Red revolution, that they wanted to get into Poland and finish the slaughter of the ones who had escaped across the border into Poland to seek refuge.

England, from time immemorial, has also been stretching out like a huge octupus annexing land to her Empire. She should not be too proud of her history. I hold no brief for Hitler and his tactics, but his greed seems no worse than that of England.

—Irma Girardot

Fort Wayne, Ind.

Hitler's Dilemma

TO THE EDITOR:

The world is incensed by Hitler's attack on Christian Poland, the little country which served as a vital link in the most un-Christian economic encirclement of Germany; the little country which concealed beneath its cloak of Christianity the operations of world controlling money changers who fled the country long before the thunder of advancing German legions could be heard in Warsaw, leaving deluded Polish peasants to fight a hopeless cause which the brightest of them might vaguely define as having something to do with "freedom and democracy."

Under the circumstances, what should Hitler have done? Should he have sat idly by to permit his nation to be weakened through economic strangulation of Versailles and encirclement to the point where it could not resist a whole world of enemies?

—Kenneth Brown

Gervais, Oregon

German People Paid

TO THE EDITOR:

Was Germany unreasonable in requesting a roadway into East Prussia, which belongs to Germany, through the Polish Corridor? Was Hitler an aggressor when he annexed no territory that was not a part of the old Germany? Or was the peace treaty of Versailles, imposed on Germany by England and France, the real aggression?

Those of us who lived back in 1914-18 recall that British propaganda of ". . . we have nothing against the German people, but the Kaiser and his government must go." Today it is ". . . Hitlerism must go." But never forget that when the penalties of Versailles were imposed, it was not the Kaiser's government, but the German people who were crushed and forced to pay and pay—the government had fled.

Those penalties were not arrived at by negotiation but by the dictation of Britain and France. America refused to sign the unjust document, thanks to American patriots in Congress during those critical days. Revenge dictated its terms and produced a Hitler. Now let Britain and France reap the fruits of revenge.

—Mary J. Leach

Indianapolis, Ind.

War-Like Executives

TO THE EDITOR:

May I quote from one of Kiplinger's Washington letters, which I believe to be very important?

"The war spirit in Washington within the Executive branch of the Government is in fact greater than throughout the country, especially the interior. By this is meant the possibility that the United States may get into the war. Within officialdom there is much stronger opinion that the United States may be drawn into the war than appears in formal official statements as published."

—Lee A. Kremer

Detroit, Mich.

A Kentucky Opportunity

TO THE EDITOR:

Having a complete collection of SOCIAL JUSTICE magazines, being alone and not wanting to store them, I would like to give them to a library or school for reference, or to anybody who would need them to fill in a collection.

I feel that they are an education in more ways than one and that they will become increasingly valuable in days to come.

Would you call attention to this in the magazine, and I will be glad to forward them.

—Miss B. Hare

Southgate, Kentucky

A Fine Article

TO THE EDITOR:

May I congratulate you on the fine article entitled *"The Years Ahead"* which appeared in the September 11th issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE.

I have thought for many years that the Catholic Church in America has been either too sure of itself or too apologetic to broadcast throughout our country our wonderful religion and all it should mean to the individual.

—Mary E. Crogan

Floral Park, N. Y.

Economic Breakdown

TO THE EDITOR:

Earl Browder stated before the Dies Committee that there would be no place in the United States for Communism if our economic system worked effectively.

If our free economy cannot work effectively, it will be replaced by an economic system operated by Government force and power, which, of course, would mean the loss of our liberties and progress. This transition can already be detected in our present governmental tendency to assume charge of industry.

Only knowledge will avert the catastrophe if this trend is carried out extensively. Should the United States enter the present war with the cost of its production far in excess of the ability of our people to pay, the tendency toward Government intervention in every phase of our lives will be greatly accelerated.

—Robert Adams

Atlantic Highlands, N. J.

Neutrality a Bulwark

TO THE EDITOR:

Notwithstanding what others may say to the contrary, we must remember that commodities, such as cotton, steel and copper may be shipped as unfinished warfare products to Canada, later finding their way to France and Britain. All these facts considered, it is well to foresee that isolationists have sharpened their axes.

The Neutrality Act, as it presently exists, should serve as a bulwark toward any warring nations. If the special session of Congress abides by these simple rules, the purpose to keep America back from the precipice of war has been settled as far as the international crisis is concerned.

Any other move eventually will detour America to war.

—Herbert J. Mancini

East Cleveland, Ohio

Socialism and Co-ops

TO THE EDITOR:

In reply to "O. S.," who seems to find a wholly imaginary connection between the Consumer Co-operative movement and Socialism, I would like to quote from the book *"Co-operative Democracy"* by James Warbasse. It clearly shows the difference between Socialism and Co-operation in the following manner:

"The difference between the socialistic or communistic state and Co-operative Society is a difference between government ownership and private ownership. . . . Private ownership of property is an inherent quality of the Co-operative Movement."

—John Grady

Philadelphia, Pa.

Would Turn Off Radio

TO THE EDITOR:

When I read in the papers that Father Coughlin was to be denied the use of the radio the thought struck me that here was dictatorship with a vengeance and the beginning of the end of constitutional government. After mulling it over in my mind the following ideas came to me and I am giving them to you for what they are worth:

I would suggest that you appeal, not only to the American Bar Association but to all the lawyers in the United States to come to your aid in fighting this ban on free speech. If the constitutional right of free speech can be denied so can all other constitutional rights and our country will become a government by decree of men and not of law, in which event the legal profession will become a nullity.

Also advise your radio audience that in case Father Coughlin is ruled off the air they voluntarily shut off their radios and leave them off until such time as free speech is restored. Thus establishing about as effective a means of waking up, not only the business men who advertise over the radio and those who own and operate radio stations, but all those employed in the advertising and radio business, as to what is taking place in this country of ours.

—J. P. Sully

Chicago, Ill.

It Is Stalin's War

Fr. Coughlin's 'Indifference'

Firm Stand for American Neutrality Does Not Imply Approval of Hitler or Stalin

By the Editor of SOCIAL JUSTICE

IN AN ADJOINING column SOCIAL JUSTICE prints an open letter to Father Coughlin by a friend and admirer.

The letter is one of scores that have come to Father Coughlin and to the editorial offices of SOCIAL JUSTICE commenting on the fate of Poland. The letters are far from agreement in what they want SOCIAL JUSTICE to do. Most of them are not as well reasoned as is the monsignor's.

There are some challenging counts in the letter's indictment of Father Coughlin. For example:

"I am scandalized by your defense of German aggression."

"I am scandalized with your indifference to the Christian cause and to the interests of the Catholic Church. . . ."

"You are indifferent toward the fate of Poland." etc. etc.

In what Sunday broadcast or in what paragraph of any article he has ever written for SOCIAL JUSTICE has Father Coughlin been guilty of any of these things?

Donates $1,000 to Polish Relief

For example, at all Masses of the Shrine of the Little Flower in Royal Oak, Michigan, last Sunday, October 8th, a special collection was taken up for Polish relief. Father Coughlin's personal contribution to this collection was $1,000.

Father Coughlin will not defend himself from attack or even from well-intentioned misunderstanding. He does not know that SOCIAL JUSTICE is making this comment; and most probably he would not approve of it if he did. But we who work with Father Coughlin, who have the benefit of his frequent counsel and direction, know that he is not an "Irishman before he is a Christian." He is not against the English people because he is against the un-Christian policies of Tony Eden and Winston Churchill; he is not against the French people because he indicts the atheism of their Leon Blum; nor was he against the Polish people when he was warning them that leaders like Joseph Beck would betray them. No more was he against the Christian Czechs when he told them unpleasant facts about their Dr. Benes.

SOCIAL JUSTICE keeps its letter forum free. We would not controvert any correspondent; but we will say in defense of Father Coughlin, that *he is a Christian priest before he is an "Irishman"* and a patriotic American before he is an "England-hater." Indeed, Father Coughlin's whole personality and program is *positive;* that is to say, he is pro-Christ, pro-America, and pro-peace. If he fights atheistic Communism by naming certain of its leaders and "handy men" in politics and public life, it is as a Christian Crusader seeking first the Kingdom of Christ and His Justice. If he is for American neutrality and so—by inference seemingly "indifferent" to the fate of this or that European people— it is because he believes with the Pope that more can be gained by Peace with Justice than by our part in any war.

Conflict Is Between Communism and Capitalism

Father Coughlin has said—as does SOCIAL JUSTICE—that this is not a war of ideologies, but of power politics, which is at base economic. The world's struggle is between a godless system of exploitation which we loosely call Capitalism — and with which, unfortunately, far too many Christian leaders are identified—and godless Communism, which thrives and grows upon the uncorrected abuses of Capitalism.

Father Coughlin—and SOCIAL JUSTICE—have always maintained that Communism *is the result of the abuses of Capitalism.* Therefore, if we were to fight Communism intelligently, we must begin with the abuses which cause Communism. And almost nobody does! For example, if industry will not pay labor a living annual wage, labor—even in America —will some day take over industry! That is Communism, but who makes the Communists? Naziism arose in Germany as a defense mechanism against Communism, but who forced Communism upon Germany?

The tag of "war guilt" was left upon the German people long after the hated Kaiser had fled. The people were loaded down with the impossible terms of an admittedly unjust treaty. Yet not once in the 20 years during which the German people laboriously climbed out of a war ruin worse than a depression; threw off an intolerable exploitation which, with reason, they blamed to certain Jews; and recovered their place in the society of nations under the handicaps of a capitalistic "lock-out" —not once did England lift a finger to lighten the unjust burden laid upon the German people.

When the recovered Germany, step by step, undertook to undo the injustices of Versailles, every move—just or not—was dubbed "aggression" and British propaganda "made another Kaiser out of Chancellor Hitler." This is no condonation of Hitler's excesses. Father Coughlin—and SOCIAL JUSTICE —have been outspoken against the godless persecution of Christians in Germany. Unfortunately, some Christian leaders identified themselves with the capitalistic exploiters while the hapless German people were left to fight both Capitalism and Communism

Communist Threat Produced Hitler

Naziism, with its Hitler, arose as a defense mechanism against Communism. There is no question but the rise of Hitler stopped an invasion of Russian Communism into Germany, and so for a time saved Christian civilization in western Europe. However, instead of hailing a deliverer and instead of forming a Christian alliance with Germany against the international menace of Soviet Russia, Christian England and Christian France talked of an alliance with the Ghengis Khan of the Kremlin to once more smash Germany.

Thus, England deliberately drove Hitler into his alliance with Stalin. And from that moment Stalin took over control of Europe. So complete is the Soviet domination of the Hitler-Stalin alliance, that one correspondent quipped: *"Joe Stalin can name postmasters in Germany!"*

Where Germany alone might have been content to annex a German Danzig as a final step in her corrections to the treaty, the alliance with Soviet Russia has caused the destruction of Christian Poland. England went to war against Germany, but up to the moment of this writing, *neither England nor France has protested the Russian occupation of Poland.* Instead, they have negotiated trade treaties with the Soviet! What's more. Russia has communized the occupied territory as fast as the invading armies advance.

This unopposed advance of Red Communism into Christian Europe is even a worse threat to civilization than was the rise of Hitler. But it was England's flirtation with Russia that destroyed Poland as a Christian bulwark against Communism. England's zeal to destroy Germany has now removed that nation as her own safeguard against Communism's invasion of the West.

What do the Hitler-haters hope to gain? No one condones the persecutions of Hitler, nor his pact with Stalin, but when Hitlerism has been destroyed, Communism will possess Germany—Communism at the very doors of Paris and London!

If the capitalistic nations carry on their three years' war needed to destroy Hitler, both England and France will become Communist before even Germany cracks!

An Open Letter To Father Coughlin

REVEREND AND DEAR FATHER COUGHLIN:

I was, and I am, one of your admirers. I admire your fighting spirit and I admire your fearless stand for the principles of social justice. Nevertheless, there are points, and important points, on which we do not agree. One of these, and the most important of these, is that you have been and you are more *"Americanus"* than *"Christianus."* You will have the same hard time with our Lord that St. Jerome experienced when he was admonished that he was more *"Ciceronianus"* than *"Christianus."* For the sake of temporal well being, you sacrifice too many of our Lord Jesus Christ's principles.

You advocate a most un-Christian and most selfish neutrality, even when no self-respecting man can be neutral or selfish.

I am scandalized with your defense of German aggression and your use of German propaganda; I am scandalized with your condemnation of the Versailles Treaty, just because this treaty forced the robbers to return stolen possessions to their former and lawful possessor; I am scandalized with your siding with might against right in the present world struggle. And, what is more, and more important, I am scandalized with your indifference to the Christian cause and to the interests of the Catholic Church inseparably connected with the present European war.

Being of Irish descent, you naturally hate and oppose England, English views, English interests and all that England stands for. I understand this — but for God's sake do you not realize that before being either an American or an Irishman you are a man and a Christian and, furthermore, a Catholic priest?

I do not care that you are indifferent toward the fate of Poland and that you are ready to ignore and sacrifice her national rights; that you are ready to minimize and reduce to *nil,* the aspirations of a noble but downtrodden people for the sake of your personal peace and your countrymen's prosperity, but, for goodness sake, how can you, a Catholic priest, be indifferent (if indifference it can be called) and sacrifice the rights, the welfare and the future of the Catholic Church for the same worldly reasons?

Can you not see that if you, and the pronoun is used advisedly, allow Germany and Russia to win this war, the Catholic Church will not only suffer, but, humanly speaking, will be doomed in Europe? You might not care to know that the churches in Poland are in flames or in ruin, and that the Polish clergy are butchered and killed by the "friendly" bolshevik neighbor. Such insignificant news as the recent massacre of forty Polish seminarians in the R. C. diocesan seminary at Lwow may not disturb you. Those butchered seminarians and murdered priests were only Poles. They do not belong to any privileged race, and there will be no meetings of indignation called for by the American intellectuals. But look here! You are a Catholic priest and your Church is mined.

If Germany and Russia should be successful in this war the mine will blast to bits the very structure of Christendom and the blood of Martyrs will swell the rivers of Europe. Can you be indifferent—can you remain pro-German—can you remain just Irish in view of all this?

Do not be offended by my sincere and open speech. Please, believe me, I love America and consider myself as good an American citizen as you are, but your position and universal conditions make it impossible for me to be silent when matters of conscience and interests of the Church are at stake.

Very respectfully yours,

MONSIGNOR A. SYSKI

Boston Plans Second Rally

BOSTON, MASS.—For the second time in six weeks, New England, and particularly the City of Boston, will voice its protest against war and un-Americanism at a giant rally to be held in the Boston Arena on Tuesday evening, October 24.

The meeting, which is to be held under the direction of the Committee for the Defense of American Constitutional Rights, will take the form of vehement opposition to the "press gang" tactics now being used by controllers of radio to remove Father Coughlin from the microphone. Maintenance of free speech for American citizens will be the watchword, and the meeting is expected to touch off a series of similar demonstrations throughout the country.

One of the main reasons for organizing the second meeting in Boston was the sabotaging by subversive agents of the first mass meeting to be held by the Constitutional Rights Committee in the Bay City on September 8. So violent was the public reaction to the obstacles put in the way of success of the September gathering that thousands of citizens, formerly uninterested, demanded a second rally.

Mr. Francis Moran will preside. Arrangement are under way to obtain, as leading speaker of the evening, Judge John A. Matthews, of Newark, New Jersey. A military band will be in attendance.

Doors will open at 7:30 o'clock. Admission is by way of ticket, but no admission price is charged. Mr. Moran can be reached at Room 204, Copley-Square Hotel.

Versailles Treaty Impossible Peace

SOCIAL JUSTICE herewith presents the second instalment of a series of brief digests of a notable book, "*Democracy and World Dominion*" by Edwin D. Schoonmaker. A third instalment will be presented next week.

IT IS AN OLD SAYING that wars grow out of other wars. Nowhere is the truth of this more apparent than in the relation of the present conflict in Europe to the settlement of the last war at Versailles. Even the men who drew up that so-called Peace Treaty knew full well that by this treaty peace had been made impossible. The author of "*Democracy and World Dominion*" lays before us numerous statements which support this fact.

Of these perhaps the most remarkable was the comment of General Tasker Bliss, the American representative on the Supreme War Council, who, rising from the signing of that document, uttered a prophecy which we have lived to see come true. "Low period, then a high period, then the devil to pay all over the world!"

Even the French saw it. Says Thomas Lamont, one of the economic advisors of the American delegation, "The French feared that they might push the thing so far that they would build up a gigantic machine over there in Germany, a "Frankenstein," that would ultimately overwhelm them, but they were willing to take the chance."

Wilson's 14 Points Mere Scrap of Paper

Even before that conference assembled two incidents had occurred which clearly revealed the state of mind of the victors and the atmosphere in which the settlement would be drawn up. The German armies had surrendered on the basis of President Wilson's Fourteen Points which Allied airplanes had dropped behind the German lines. Once arms had been laid down, however, that solemn promise instantly became a scrap of paper. And not only was it completely discarded as a basis of peace but, on threat of further punishment, Germany was compelled to sign a confession of war guilt, a humiliation unheard of in all the annals of war.

The second incident even more certain to create that hatred and resentment which produce war, was the scrapping of that other solemn promise: that the Allies would see to it that the people of prostrate Germany should not starve. Then, arms having been laid down, they refused to allow the German government to use its own gold for the purchase of food.

"They wanted her to hold on to that gold," says Thomas Lamont, "and turn it over to the Allies for reparation." As a consequence 800,000 German men, women, and children died of starvation!

Germany Surrounded by Alsace-Lorraines

Turning to the Treaty itself, the author compares its harsh terms with those imposed by Bismarck following the Franco-Prussian war. The return of Alsace-Lorraine, old German provinces which the Bourbons had annexed, and the payment of an indemnity of $1-billion, a payment completed within two years after which France was able to resume her normal life. By the terms of Versailles the amount to be paid by the Germans was left indefinite, British and French statesmen assuring their people that Germany would be compelled to pay the entire cost of the war, a sum estimated at more than $350-billion. Instead of one Alsace-Lorraine there were now to be Alsace-Lorraines all round the German borders!

"Three million people of the German race with their lands and industries were handed over to Czecho-Slovakia; in the south, 250,000 in a solid block were given to Italy. To Belgium was allotted Eupen and Malmedy, thriving cities of the German Rhineland; to Denmark, the rich district of Schleswig-Holstein; Danzig and Memel, German seaports in the north, were put under commissions of the Allied Powers. Nor were other parts of Germany to escape. Hamburg and Stettin were thereafter to belong not to Germany alone, for through these German ports the Allies of Eastern Europe were to have access to the sea, for the rivers of Germany, the Elb, the Oder, the Danube, and the Rhine, were to be internationalized. A race 80-million strong had not only been chopped to pieces but had been subjected to indignities to which no major race in Europe had ever been subjected."

The author also compares the Versailles settlement with the settlement which followed the defeat of Napoleon, who, for twenty years, had ravened over Europe annexing territories and distributing crowns. "France retained the same limits as she had possessed under her kings and consequently, Alsace and Lorraine, which in former times belonged to Germany, while she also had secured to her an extent of territory conquered during the wars of the republic. She had likewise, in addition to this, no share to pay of the expense of the war. No confiscation of colonies, no dismemberment of the homeland, no levying of a tribute to burden unborn generations, no internationalization of rivers, no seizure of banks and railways, no restrictions upon trade, no confiscation of private property of citizens in foreign lands, no destruction of her every weapon of war, no enforced leaving open of a section of her borders, no demand for the restoration of devastated areas which extended from the Pyramids to Moscow, no extorted confession of war guilt, no starving of 800,000 men, women and children to secure gold."

To satisfy the democratic ideals which, held aloft, had brought allies to Britain and France, there was set up at Geneva the League of Nations, the object of which, its preamble declared, was, among other things, "to achieve international peace and security." Analyzing one by one the articles of the Covenant, Mr. Schoonmaker reveals its true character. Although it provided for a revision of treaties "the existence of which might endanger the peace of the world," including that of Versailles, such revision, it had shrewdly been arranged, could only be accomplished with the unanimous consent of the Council upon which Great Britain and France were to have permanent seats. Thus, while fifty nations had been brought together under the illusion that they were promoting peace and justice, actually they were there to make permanent the order of things set up at Versailles which they were powerless to alter. But not only this. They had bound themselves to preserve the *status quo* throughout the world.

What this involved we can readily understand if we look out over the world and see what that existing order was. "During the fifty years following the Franco-Prussian war, Great Britain had conquered and annexed the following territories: Baluchistan, Burma, Cyprus, Wei-hai-wei, Hongkong, Koweit, Sinai, North Guinea, South Guinea, East Guinea, Solomon Islands, Togo Islands, Sudan, Uganda, British East Africa, British Somaliland, Zanzibar, Transvaal, Orange Free State, Rhodesia, British Central Africa, Nigeria." And the Republic of France, equally busy in all parts of the world, had extended her imperial domain to limits which would have astonished the Bourbons and the Bonapartes. To the vast possessions thus acquired the Great War had brought the democratic partners the colonies of Imperial Germany, another million square miles. This was the existing order which fifty nations had obligated themselves to preserve for all time. They might imagine they were sitting at Geneva preserving peace and democracy. Actually, as the author says, "they were in Algiers and Morocco, in Egypt and India, in the jungles of Africa and the cities of China, guarding the frontiers of the great imperial Powers as unmistakably as the Gauls, the Britons and other subject tribes which had been admitted into the famous Legion, guarded the frontiers of Imperial Rome."

Thankful for Readers' Prayers

Reverend Chas. E. Coughlin
Royal Oak, Michigan

Dear Father:

I wish to thank you in behalf of my family, myself and my sister, Miss Cele Bespole, whose name was published in the last issue of your paper, for the prayers that were said for her. She recently had an operation, and is now convalescing and feeling fine. We are sure that the prayers of your subscribers and yourself helped a great deal. Our appreciation is genuine, and we do place much faith in prayer.

Thank you again.

Respectfully,
MRS. LILLIAN GRAVES

Chicago, Ill.

The League of the Little Flower Requests You to pray for the Sick and the Dead

"I beseech you therefore, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ and by the charity of the Holy Ghost, that you help me in your prayers for me to God." ROMANS 15:30

ILL

ILLINOIS
Chicago
Mr. and Mrs. Wm. D. Hagan

MICHIGAN
Eloise
Hattie Powell
Royal Oak
Mrs. Kent Johnson

MISSISSIPPI
Moss Point
Mr. John M. Gill

NEW JERSEY
Atlantic City
Miss Catherine McGarry
Orange
Miss Ellen Murray
Sister Mary Cecelia
Sister Mary Dionysia
Sister Mary Leocadia

NEW YORK
Corning
Sister M. Consilio
New York City
Miss Rose Shannon Hornell
Miss Gertrude E. Magner
North Troy
Phillip J. Whalen
Pelham
Msgr. McNichols
Rockville Centre
Miss G. M. O'Connell
Rye
Msgr. Wm. J. Murphy
Utica
Fred Le Fave
Wellsville
Mr. Dennis R. McCarthy
Mrs. David R. Magner
White Plains
George Keller
Sister Mary Blanche
Sister Mary Frederick
Sister Mary Gertrude
Sister Mary Henrietta
Sister Mary Imelda

OKLAHOMA
Seminole
Mr. and Mrs. Joseph M. McCarthy, Sr.

PENNSYLVANIA
Warren
Mr. John T. McCarthy

DECEASED

CONNECTICUT
Hartford
Mr. Wm. Kelleher

ILLINOIS
Clifton
Mrs. Mary McKay
L'Erable
David Coash

IOWA
Cedar Rapids
William Spencer

MASSACHUSETTS
Everett
Mrs. Marion Loleta Wentworth
Quincy
Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Carmody
Josephine and Richard Carmody

MICHIGAN
Kalamazoo
Thos. W. Kiefter, Jr.

NEW JERSEY
Englewood
Rev. John J. Crake
Orange
Sarah E. Denehy
Union City
Peter Sorenson

NEW YORK
Brooklyn
Mrs. Bridget M. McNamara
New Rochelle
John Bauer
Wellsville
Margaret Dean

PENNSYLVANIA
Roxborough
John Tresnan

RHODE ISLAND
Providence
Charles McKenna

Divine Heart of Jesus convert sinners, save the dying, deliver the holy souls from purgatory (Indulgence of 300 days, every time Pius X, Nov. 6, 1906).

You are invited to join the League of the Little Flower.

BENEFITS: 1. You are remembered every morning at Mass at the Shrine of the Little Flower.

2. You are remembered every morning at a Special Mass said for our intentions at the Tomb of Christ near Jerusalem.

OBLIGATION: Each day say the Lord's Prayer for the intention of the Little Flower. Her intention is to lead souls back to God.

PRIVILEGES: You are privileged to enclose the names of the deceased members of your family. They will be remembered each day at the Sacrifice of the Mass.

FEES: Each living member is requested to contribute one dollar a year.

The money derived from this will be used to help Father Coughlin promote his religious activities.

Mail your membership dues to Father Coughlin at Royal Oak, Mich.

Your prayers are earnestly solicited for our sick friends and for the faithful departed who have recently passed to their reward.

Wishing to take part in the activities of the League of the Little Flower, I hereby make application to become one of its members.

Herewith is enclosed.....dollar(s) as membership fee for the League of the Little Flower for the person(s) listed below:

Name .....

Street .....

City and State .....

Organize Your Community Now!

Father Coughlin has put forth a call for the formation in every city, town and hamlet in America of a Committee for the Defense of Freedom of Speech. This was done as a response to efforts of those who control the very air of America to ban him from the nation's radio.

Lose no time in forming your committee. Let it be headed by the most outstanding and responsible citizens obtainable in your community. Let it be articulate, active and forceful.

We are in the thick of a battle to retain the right to speak our minds. We MUST save in our country the voice of Truth, coming weekly from Royal Oak. This is your duty as a Christian and an American. Perform that duty now.

The axe of regimentation is slowly but certainly falling on America. Gradually the fingers of international Communism are pressing — pressing on the throat of the nation — gagging any expression of Americanism that might go forth from the lips of genuine Americans.

Last week Father Coughlin fell under the descending axe. Because of pressure from above, the nation's broadcasters decided he could not buy air time because he is CONTROVERSIAL. Though most stations in his network are remaining loyal, they are being picked out one by one and "put on the spot."

The word to the stations is: "Get rid of Coughlin — or else —" The "else" means the boycott and other squeezing methods used by those who control the nation's advertising and news sources.

The hour has struck, fellow Americans, to begin in earnest the fight to keep the Priest of Royal Oak before the microphone. The gauntlet is down—the barricades up!

We are fighting a losing battle—unless every man, woman or youth in this nation who desires to retain free speech and liberty joins our ranks NOW.

Father Coughlin needs the help of every reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE and needs it NOW. The enemy forces are backed by tons of gold and unlimited currency. Royal Oak has only its friends.

But, if those friends unite TODAY in a solid phalanx in aid of American liberty and freedom of speech, Father Coughlin must win in the end.

The hour is dark, but the sunrise must come. It cannot come unless you help out.

Regardless of what you can do—do it —as an American.

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., INC.
Royal Oak, Michigan.

I wish to contribute to the 1939-1940 Broadcasting Fund so that Father Coughlin may continue to spread principles of genuine Americanism.

I hereby pledge the sum of $_____ which I am enclosing herewith or which I will send in two equal monthly remittances on or before Oct. 25 and on or before Nov. 25.

My Name Is _____

My Address Is _____

City or Town _____ State _____

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

RADIO STATION WMCA DENIES PILFERING CODE

'Only Advertised It to Attract Listeners'

Donald Flamm
Manager of WMCA

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Donald Flamm, president of the Knickerbocker Broadcasting Company, which operates radio station WMCA in New York City, testified at a hearing before the Federal Communications Commission that his station had not decoded official messages of foreign powers but had only advertised that it did so.

An international accord, signed by the United States, Great Britain, Germany and several other nations, prohibits decoding of international communications.

Mr. Flamm was before the commission to show cause why his license should not be revoked, after the station's owners had advertised in a trade paper that it decoded and broadcast official messages intercepted between foreign nations.

COMMENT: Mr. Flamm explained that WMCA's news is obtained from the same sources as other radio stations and newspapers got theirs. Thus, while station WMCA saved its license and escaped punishment from the F.C.C., it invited action from the Department of Commerce for false advertising.

This was not the first flagrant offense of station WMCA to be brought to the attention of authorities. Until a few weeks ago a musical interlude *was used to advertise a "sexual jelly!"* This, of course, was a "controversial" commercial broadcast and an affront not only to morality but to public welfare.

WMCA was one of the first Jewish-owned radio stations to breach its contract with Father Coughlin on the grounds that Christian opposition to Communism is "controversial." The station's action was admittedly taken at the instance of the Jewish General Council, which both resented, and rejected, Father Coughlin's invitation that Jews join Christians in opposing Communism, and in repudiating Communism's persecution of Christians in Soviet Russia and Red Spain.

The Jewish leadership in this country not only spurned Father Coughlin's invitation to combat Communism, but set on foot in the Jewish press a most vicious anti-Coughlin "smear campaign," and pressured Jewish-owned radio stations to silence the voice of the Christian priest.

The same Jewish influence authored the suppressive Code by which members of the National Association of Broadcasters are now being pressured to refuse to renew radio contracts with Father Coughlin. This time it is his opposition to the war schemes of the internationalists that is "controversial."

New York Christians, deprived of the radio broadcasts for which they had paid, protested to advertisers on WMCA and formed a picket line before the station each Sunday afternoon. Communist "plants" were placed in the line to shout anti-Semitic invectives and a device was set up to record the disturbances. When pickets themselves caused police to remove these disturbers, Mayor LaGuardia put a stop to the picketing of WMCA by proclaiming New York City to be in a "state of war emergency." Police were ordered to prevent assemblages before "foreign-owned properties" and, oddly enough, this ruling was invoked to stop the picket line at WMCA.